Theodore Roosevelt.

3 2769 01 794 251

7272

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/presidentialaddr0006theo

Homeward Bound Edition

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES AND STATE PAPERS

January 16, 1907, to October 25, 1907

BY

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

DISCARDED
LIBRARY

PUBLISHED WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE
AUTHOR THROUGH SPECIAL ARRANGEMENT

VOLUME VI

NEW YORK
THE REVIEW OF REVIEWS COMPANY
MCMX

The Publishers desire to make clear to the readers that Ex-president Roosevelt retains no pecuniary interest in the sale of the volumes containing these speeches. He feels that the material contained in these addresses has been dedicated to the public, and that it is, therefore, not to be handled as copyrighted material from which Mr. Roosevelt should receive any pecuniary return.

173.911
R00

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES AND STATE PAPERS

JANUARY 16, 1907
TO
OCTOBER 25, 1907

AT THE BANQUET OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE ARLINGTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, JANUARY 16, 1907

Mr. Chairman; Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a peculiar pleasure to me to greet you here this evening on behalf of the National Government; and in greeting all of you let me say how particularly pleased I am that we should have the Governors of the great States of Virginia and Maryland with us this evening. Every public official who has a proper sense of the obligations of his oath of office, whatever party he may belong to, once that he is in office must feel that he is the servant of all the people. That is true of all public officials, but perhaps it is in a special sense true of the Secretary of State of the Union, for our party lines stop at the water's edge. The minute that we get beyond the limits of our own country we are, all of us, American and nothing else. It is in the fullest recognition of that spirit that Secretary Root acts and has always acted.

In speaking to you this evening I need say but little beyond stating to you that what Mr. Root has already said to you has my full and unqualified endorsement. In the few words that I have to say, I shall dwell purely on three policies which Mr. Root has developed that are completely non-partisan, completely in the interest of the

Nation as a whole. I intend to say just a few words to you on the question of our relations to Santo Domingo, upon our consular service, and upon the effort to secure better trade relations with South and Central America and the Orient.

First, as to our relations with the Dominican Republic. The United States holds and must hold a peculiar position in the Western Hemisphere. This position must never be one of oppression of or aggression toward her weaker neighbors; it must be one of helpfulness toward them; it must be an attitude of helping them to stand on their own feet. Under Mr. Root's guidance we are now endeavoring to secure by treaty with Santo Domingo an arrangement designed to make it absolutely unnecessary for this country ever to think of intervention in Santo Domingo; because it is an effort to prevent the possibility of the occurrence of conditions there which would necessitate such intervention. Two years ago things in the island got into such a shape that we became satisfied that certain European Powers, if we did not take some step to better conditions, would themselves take possession of certain ports in the island. We had to act to prevent action by others. Since then we have been striving to develop some scheme by which Santo Domingo could secure a financial prosperity and stability that would enable her to pay the *just* debts that she owed to outsiders, while at the same time being free from any possibility of aggression by

outsiders or by ourselves. I will not go into the details of the present arrangement—an arrangement as yet in part but tentative—but the salient features are that we are trying to negotiate a treaty by which we shall loan to Santo Domingo certain men to collect the customs revenues, forty-five per cent to be turned over to the government of the island for its own expenses, the remainder to be applied in accordance with the agreement entered into between the Republic and her creditors for the settlement of her debts. Meanwhile, for two years, the island has been going on under a tentative agreement to the same effect, and how well it has worked is proved by this fact alone: Santo Domingo has received but forty-five per cent of her revenues, yet that forty-five per cent, as collected by the officials whom we have sent down there, has given her a larger revenue than she has ever had before even when she nominally got all of it. Meanwhile the rest of the money collected is being accumulated, and already forms a very substantial nucleus for the payment of the entire debt; and if this arrangement can be, in whatever shape, perpetuated, the chance of disorder is lessened (because one great object of revolutions in Santo Domingo has been to get possession of the custom-houses, and at present that possession is denied), while the chance of foreign interference has vanished, and we are saved from the disagreeable possibility of having to intervene in the island. I think that those three objects are worth accomplishing, and if Mr. Root

has his way, or any reasonable portion of his way, they will be accomplished.

Second, as to the consular service. I wish now to express my deep sense of obligation to this gathering for the way in which its members in time past have worked to secure the putting of the consular service of the United States upon a proper basis of non-partisanship and business efficiency. You recommended the passage of a law to secure these ends by Congress. There has been some little question as to whether such a law would be constitutional, because it limits the power of appointment, its opponents expressing the most ardent desire that my constitutional powers should not be infringed upon —a solicitude, gentlemen, to which I am totally unaccustomed. It was advanced that it was impossible to limit the President's power as I had recommended that it should be limited. Without discussing the constitutional question raised, I may say that as Congress did not limit my appointing power, Secretary Root did, and we adopted regulations which in effect put into force the measure as you recommended that it should be enacted into law, providing for a system of promotion so that the higher grades should be filled only by promotion of those who prove themselves worthy, and providing for a system of rigid tests of the fitness of those entering the service who are required to enter it in the lower grades. I am glad to say that during the period of about a year since we have been applying these methods we have appointed men

from all sections of the country and of all varieties of political belief, and that the higher positions have been filled, when vacancies have occurred, only by the promotion of those most fit, most competent to fill them. I believe that a very great improvement has been worked in the consular service. I want to say here, however, that I do not believe in restricting the power of removal. In your private businesses each one of you knows that you will often find that some man becomes unsatisfactory, and that it will be an advantage to get rid of him; but you would not want to try him in a court. As you know, in all branches of the service, civil and military, I keep and shall continue to keep a wide door of exit for the unfit—discussion as to whether the door shall be closed or not being of a purely academic character, because I alone have power to close it.

Now, gentlemen, I am not prepared to speak as to whether or not it would transgress the requirements of the Constitution to enact into law such a system as that you advocate, which system has been put in force by Executive regulation in the consular service. If so, I very much wish that the Congress would at least pass a resolution expressing approval of the action of the Administration in establishing this system of regulation. That would largely accomplish our object of putting the system on a permanent basis.

Finally, gentlemen, I wish to speak of the effort which we are now making to extend and strengthen our commercial relations with South America and

the Orient by the passage of laws designed to secure swift and adequate communication by steam with South and Central America, Asia, and Australia. I must frankly admit that I never fully realized the importance of this movement, that I never took a very great interest in it, until after Mr. Root came back from his momentous South American trip last summer, and after I had listened to what he had to say as to the humiliation it was to us nationally and the loss to us materially to have our merchants, our residents, in South America in the position of finding that normally they had to communicate with the northern half of their own hemisphere by going to Europe. Mr. Root's trip to South America was designed especially to give proof of, and at the same time to strengthen, the bonds of friendly interest that knit the republics of the Western Hemisphere together. He found that there was a general feeling down there among the people themselves, and among Americans there resident, that in addition to political friendliness, we needed commercial intimacy, and that it was quite impossible to get such commercial intimacy without a far better system of communication between North and South America. The proposed measure will be of benefit to all sections of our country, and that is one reason why it is so eminently fitting that an organization like this, representing East and West, North and South, the Pacific and the Atlantic, the interior as much as the seacoast, should take the interest it does in this question. For, of course, it is not only the seaboard

cities that are interested in lines of ships to South America, it is the people who send what is in the ships, and they live in the interior just as much as on the seacoast.

A bill has been prepared almost exactly in line with Secretary Root's Kansas City speech, and with the recommendations contained in the reports of the Postmaster-General and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. It is not an experimental bill. It is modeled almost exactly on the recent Cunard contract with the British Government. It covers communication with South America and with the Orient. In South America the chief aim is to provide better American lines to the commercial countries of South America, better lines than the present foreign lines of steamships that go there. At the present day the only big ships carrying the American flag which those republics see are our warships. I want them to see some peace ships as well. I want the republics of South America to be convinced not only of our political friendship, but of our trade friendship also. This bill is an absolute necessity if we are to meet foreign competition. American shipmasters are at a disadvantage in competition with those of other countries, because we demand better treatment in the shape of wages, food, and accommodations for our seamen. We can not afford to do otherwise, and therefore we must meet foreign competition in some other way than at the expense of the seamen on our ships. This bill provides for sixteen-knot ships. In the world's foreign trade at present

there are 196 ocean steamships of sixteen knots or more, and of those fully 150 now draw subsidies, postal, admiralty, or both, from foreign governments. Again, we need shipyards in this country as well as battleships. They must be kept fairly well employed on large projects of construction or they can not be thoroughly efficient. The British "Dreadnought" was built at a speed three times as great as we can show here in building similar ships, because they have shipyards that are kept fully employed, and they have therefore an advantage in proficiency that we can not have under present conditions. This bill would for some years supply just the incentive that is needed in that direction. Besides the considerations of trade involved in this bill, do not forget that there are involved certain other things. The Monroe Doctrine is involved, and, gentlemen, there is not in all the world a doctrine advanced by any civilized power which is more emphatically in the interest of the peace of the world than the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine is, of course, essentially one that has reference to South and Central America. This bill devotes annually a little over $2,000,000 to building twenty fast steamers for the South American lines. In the next place, our interests in the Pacific are properly cared for under this bill, for we devote nearly $1,800,000 to sixteen steamers which are to traverse the Pacific Ocean, to take in our Pacific possessions, Hawaii and the Philippines, and the trade with the great countries of Asia and with the great English-

speaking commonwealths of Australia and New Zealand. The bill is well balanced geographically. On the Atlantic, fourteen steamers; on the Pacific, taking in the trade of the Pacific with South America, with Asia and Australia, twenty-two steamers. That is as it should be. The Pacific is a little larger than the Atlantic; and, anyhow, all good Americans are good Westerners. During the century that is now opening the development of the Pacific and of the lands around it will be the great phenomenon in the development of the human race. Not only is America, and, I am happy to say now, South America as well as North America, certain as a whole to enjoy a phenomenal development like that which our country has shown and will continue to show; but we shall also see a similar development in Australia; while Asia's growth is no less certain. Surely our people will not be content to lag behind others in the peaceful and friendly contest to see which nation can best do its full share of the commercial work of the Pacific.

The bill does another thing. It provides for a naval reserve, such a reserve as we need for our navy. It is a matter for honest pride to every American that we now have a navy respectable in size and a good deal more than respectable in the character of the ships and the character of the men aboard them. Our aim must be to provide a naval reserve from which we can in the event of war draw a certain number of men already trained to their work. A modern battleship is one of the most deli-

cate and complicated of all bits of mechanism, and a raw man aboard it is worse than useless. You can not train a man to be of any use aboard a battleship after war has once begun. In the event of war the usefulness of our ships will depend mainly upon the quality of the men already aboard them and upon the number, which under no circumstances can be more than a small number, of men who can be put aboard them, able at once to do as good work as those already aboard. Remember, gentlemen, that the prime use of the United States Navy is to avert war. The United States Navy is the cheapest insurance Uncle Sam has. It is the surest guaranty against our ever being drawn into war; and the guaranty is effective just in proportion as the Navy is efficient.

In our foreign policy our aim must be to treat with scrupulous fairness and justice every foreign power, European or Asiatic, large or small; to treat every foreign power upon the basis of asking nothing from any one of them that we do not gladly do in return. The attitude that we are willing to have them take toward us we have a right to expect that they shall not object to our taking toward them; but no other. Let us treat every power with justice, every power with courtesy. Courtesy is not an expensive commodity, but is a mighty valuable one, and I trust that not merely our public men but our publicists and our private men who address public meetings will remember that while it is purely our own affair as to the standard of manners we

observe in dealing with one another, this is not so when we deal with outsiders. It behooves us all invariably to use a tone of courtesy and consideration in dealing with any foreign nation. That is one side of it, but there is another. Let us not give any other nation any cause for offence; and, on the other hand, keep our navy at such a pitch of efficiency as to make it a strong provocative of good manners in other nations.

So, gentlemen, I earnestly hope that your meeting here in the National capital will be of immediate good along all three of the lines that I have mentioned, and especially that we shall see as one of its results the entering of this Nation on the policy of securing an adequate representation of fast steamship lines from this country, both from the Pacific and Atlantic ports, to South and Central America, to Asia, and to Australia.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
January 16, 1907

To the HON. HILARY A. HERBERT, chairman, CHIEF JUSTICE SETH SHEPHERD, GENERAL MARCUS J. WRIGHT, JUDGE CHARLES B. HOWRY, MR. WILLIAM A. GORDON, MR. THOMAS NELSON PAGE, PRESIDENT EDWIN ALDERMAN, MR. JOSEPH WILMER, and others of the Committee of Arrangement for the Celebration of the Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of General Robert E. Lee.

Gentlemen:

I regret that it is not in my power to be with you

at your celebration. I join with you in honoring the life and career of that great soldier and high-minded citizen whose fame is now a matter of pride to all our countrymen. Terrible though the destruction of the Civil War was, awful though it was that such a conflict should occur between brothers, it is yet a matter for gratitude on the part of all Americans that this, alone among contests of like magnitude, should have left to both sides as a priceless heritage the memory of the mighty men and the glorious deeds that the iron days brought forth. The courage and steadfast endurance, the lofty fealty to the right as it was given to each man to see the right, whether he wore the gray or whether he wore the blue, now make the memories of the valiant feats, alike of those who served under Grant and of those who served under Lee, precious to all good Americans. General Lee has left us the memory, not merely of his extraordinary skill as a general, his dauntless courage and high leadership in campaign and battle, but also of that serene greatness of soul characteristic of those who most readily recognize the obligations of civic duty. Once the war was over he instantly undertook the task of healing and binding up the wounds of his countrymen, in the true spirit of those who feel malice toward none and charity toward all; in that spirit which from the throes of the Civil War brought forth the real and indissoluble Union of to-day. It was eminently fitting that this great man, this war-worn veteran of a mighty struggle,

who, at its close, simply and quietly undertook his duty as a plain, every-day citizen, bent only upon helping his people in the paths of peace and tranquillity, should turn his attention toward educational work; toward bringing up in fit fashion the younger generation, the sons of those who had proved their faith by their endeavor in the heroic days.

There is no need to dwell on General Lee's record as a soldier. The son of Light Horse Harry Lee of the Revolution, he came naturally by his aptitude for arms and command. His campaigns put him in the foremost rank of the great captains of all time. But his signal valor and address in war are no more remarkable than the spirit in which he turned to the work of peace once the war was over. The circumstances were such that most men, even of high character, felt bitter and vindictive or depressed and spiritless, but General Lee's heroic temper was not warped nor his great soul cast down. He stood that hardest of all strains, the strain of bearing himself well through the gray evening of failure; and therefore out of what seemed failure he helped to build the wonderful and mighty triumph of our national life, in which all his countrymen, North and South, share. Immediately after the close of hostilities he announced, with a clear-sightedness which at that time few indeed of any section possessed, that the interests of the Southern States were the same as those of the United States; that the prosperity of the South would rise or fall

with the welfare of the whole country; and that the duty of its citizens appeared too plain to admit of doubt. He urged that all should unite in honest effort to obliterate the effects of war and restore the blessings of peace; that they should remain in the country, strive for harmony and good feeling, and devote their abilities to the interests of their people and the healing of dissensions. To every one who applied to him this was the advice he gave. Although absolutely without means, he refused all offers of pecuniary aid, and all positions of emolument, although many such, at a high salary, were offered him. He declined to go abroad, saying that he sought only "a place to earn honest bread while engaged in some useful work." This statement brought him the offer of the presidency of Washington College, a little institution in Lexington, Va., which had grown out of a modest foundation known as Liberty Hall Academy. Washington had endowed this academy with one hundred shares of stock that had been given to him by the State of Virginia, which he had accepted only on condition that he might with them endow some educational institution. To the institution which Washington helped to found in such a spirit, Lee, in the same fine spirit, gave his services. He accepted the position of president at a salary of $1,500 a year, in order, as he stated, that he might do some good to the youth of the South. He applied himself to his new work with the same singleness of mind which he had shown in leading the Army of Northern

Virginia. All the time by word and deed he was striving for the restoration of real peace, of real harmony, never uttering a word of bitterness nor allowing a word of bitterness uttered in his presence to go unchecked. From the close of the war to the time of his death all his great powers were devoted to two objects: to the reconciliation of all his countrymen with one another, and to fitting the youth of the South for the duties of a lofty and broad-minded citizenship.

Such is the career that you gather to honor; and I hope that you will take advantage of the one hundredth anniversary of General Lee's birth by appealing to all our people, in every section of this country, to commemorate his life and deeds by the establishment, at some great representative educational institution of the South, of a permanent memorial, that will serve the youth of the coming years, as he, in the closing years of his life, served those who so sorely needed what he so freely gave.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

TO DELEGATION OF FORT FISHER VETERANS, AT THE WHITE HOUSE, JANUARY 18, 1907

Mr. Sherman:

It gives me genuine pleasure to greet this organization. Many different organizations of our countrymen are received here at the White House; but, after all, while they all have the right to come, the right is most complete in the case of those to whom

we owe it that we have a National Government at all—you veterans of the Civil War. I am pleased to learn how well you were received by the men who wore the gray. To-morrow night a letter of mine will be read on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the birthday of Lee; and it is just such action as that of your organization in fraternizing with the organization of ex-Confederate soldiers by whom you were received, which accentuates the truth of what I have said in that letter; that this war, the great war for the Union, alone among contests of like magnitude in modern times, has left us the right to be proud, not only of the Union (which by your deeds has become in very truth a union throughout the length and breadth of this land), but of the courage and steadfast devotion to the right as each man saw the right alike of the men who wore the blue and of the men who wore the gray.

I want to bear testimony to the fact that wherever I speak to an audience of veterans of the Civil War I speak to an audience composed, not only of good citizens in their several localities, but of men who have been consistently striving to show in their deeds their belief in the words of Abraham Lincoln, by conducting themselves "with malice toward none and with charity toward all."

MESSAGE COMMUNICATED TO THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS, JANUARY 23, 1907

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I call your attention to the great desirability of enacting legislation to help American shipping and American trade by encouraging the building and running of lines of large and swift steamers to South America and the Orient.

The urgent need of our country's making an effort to do something like its share of carrying trade on the ocean has been called to our attention in striking fashion by the experience of Secretary Root on his recent South American tour. The result of these experiences he has set forth in his address before the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress at Kansas City, Mo., on November 20 last —an address so important that it deserves the careful study of all public men.

The facts set forth by Mr. Root are striking, and they can not but arrest the attention of our people. The great continent to the south of us, which should be knit to us by the closest commercial ties, is hardly in direct commercial communication with us at all, its commercial relations being almost exclusively with Europe. Between all the principal South American ports and Europe lines of swift and commodious steamers, subsidized by their home governments, ply regularly. There is no such line of steamers between these ports and the United States. In consequence, our shipping in South

American ports is almost a negligible quantity; for instance, in the year ending June 30, 1905, there entered the port of Rio de Janeiro over three thousand steamers and sailing vessels from Europe, but from the United States no steamers and only seven sailing vessels, two of which were in distress. One prime reason for this state of things is the fact that those who now do business on the sea do business in a world not of natural competition but of subsidized competition. State aid to steamship lines is as much a part of the commercial system of today as State employment of consuls to promote business. Our commercial competitors in Europe pay in the aggregate some twenty-five millions a year to their steamship lines—Great Britain paying nearly seven millions. Japan pays between three and four millions. By the proposed legislation the United States will still pay relatively less than any one of our competitors pays. Three years ago the Trans-Mississippi Congress formally set forth as axiomatic the statement that every ship is a missionary of trade, that steamship lines work for their own countries just as railroad lines work for their terminal points, and that it is as absurd for the United States to depend upon foreign ships to distribute its products as it would be for a department store to depend upon wagons of a competing house to deliver its goods. This statement is the literal truth.

Moreover, it must be remembered that American ships do not have to contend merely against the sub-

sidization of their foreign competitors. The higher wages and the greater cost of maintenance of American officers and crews make it almost impossible for our people who do business on the ocean to compete on equal terms with foreign ships unless they are protected somewhat as their fellow-countrymen who do business on land are protected. We can not as a country afford to have the wages and the manner of life of our seamen cut down; and the only alternative, if we are to have seamen at all, is to offset the expense by giving some advantage to the ship itself.

The proposed law which has been introduced in Congress is in no sense experimental. It is based on the best and most successful precedents, as, for instance, on the recent Cunard contract with the British Government. As far as South America is concerned, its aim is to provide from the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts better American lines to the great ports of South America than the present European lines. The South American republics now see only our warships. Under this bill our trade friendship will be made evident to them. The bill proposes to build large-sized steamers of sixteen-knot speed. There are nearly two hundred such steamships already in the world's foreign trade, and over three-fourths of them now draw subsidies—postal or admiralty or both. The bill will encourage our shipyards, which are almost as necessary to the national defence as battleships, and the efficiency of which depends in large measure upon their steady

employment in large construction. The proposed bill is of importance to our Navy because it gives a considerable fleet of auxiliary steamships, such as is now almost wholly lacking, and also provides for an effective naval reserve.

The bill provides for fourteen steamships, subsidized to the extent of over a million and a half, from the Atlantic Coast, all to run to South American ports. It provides on the Pacific Coast for twenty-two steamers, subsidized to the extent of two millions and a quarter, some of these to run to South America, most of them to Manila, Australia, and Asia. Be it remembered that while the ships will be owned on the coasts, the cargoes will largely be supplied by the interior, and that the bill will benefit the Mississippi Valley as much as it benefits the seaboard.

I have laid stress upon the benefit to be expected from our trade with South America. The lines to the Orient are also of vital importance. The commercial possibilities of the Pacific are unlimited, and for national reasons it is imperative that we should have direct and adequate communication by American lines with Hawaii and the Philippines. The existence of our present steamship lines on the Pacific is seriously threatened by the foreign subsidized lines. Our communications with the markets of Asia and with our own possessions in the Philippines, no less than our communications with Australia, should depend not upon foreign, but upon our own, steamships. The Southwest and the North-

west should alike be served by these lines, and if this is done they will also give to the Mississippi Valley throughout its entire length the advantage of all transcontinental railways running to the Pacific Coast. To fail to establish adequate lines on the Pacific is equivalent to proclaiming to the world that we have neither the ability nor the disposition to contend for our rightful share of the commerce of the Orient; nor yet to protect our interests in the Philippines. It would surely be discreditable for us to surrender to our commercial rivals the great commerce of the Orient, the great commerce we should have with South America, and even our own communications with Hawaii and the Philippines.

I earnestly hope for the enactment of some law like the bill in question.

THE ANCIENT IRISH SAGAS*

Next to developing original writers in its own time, the most fortunate thing, from the literary standpoint, which can befall any people is to have revealed to it some new treasure-house of literature. This treasure-house may be stored with the writings of another people in the present, or else with the writings of a buried past. But a few generations ago, in that innocent age when Blackstone could speak of the "Goths, Huns, Franks, and

*Included in this volume because, although not an address or a State paper, it was written by Mr. Roosevelt while President. It was published in "The Century" for January, 1907. Copyright, 1906, by The Century Co. All rights reserved.

Vandals"—incongruous gathering—as "Celtic" tribes, the long-vanished literatures of the ancestors of the present European nations, the epics, the sagas, the stories in verse or prose, were hardly known to, or regarded by, their educated and cultivated descendants. Gradually, and chiefly in the nineteenth century, these forgotten literatures, or fragments of them, were one by one recovered. They are various in merit and interest, in antiquity and extent—"Beowulf," the Norse sagas, the "Kalevala," the "Nibelungenlied," the "Song of Roland," the Arthurian cycle of romances. In some there is but one great poem; in some all the poems or stories are of one type; in others, as in the case of the Norse sagas, a wide range of history, myth, and personal biography is covered. In our own day there has at last come about a popular revival of interest in the wealth of poems and tales to be found in the ancient Celtic, and especially in the ancient Erse, manuscripts—the whole forming a body of prose and poetry of great and wellnigh unique interest from every standpoint, which in some respects can be matched only by the Norse sagas, and which has some striking beauties the like of which are not to be found even in these Norse sagas.

For many decades German, French, Irish, and English students have worked over the ancient Celtic texts, and recently many of the more striking and more beautiful stories have been reproduced or paraphrased in popular form by writers like

Lady Gregory and Miss Hull, Lady Gregory showing in her prose something of the charm which her countrywoman, Emily Lawless, shows in her poems "With the Wild Geese." It is greatly to be regretted that America should have done so little either in the way of original study and research in connection with the early Celtic literature, or in the way of popularizing and familiarizing that literature, and it is much to be desired that, wherever possible, chairs of Celtic should be established in our leading universities. Moreover, in addition to the scholar's work which is especially designed for students, there must ultimately be done the additional work which puts the results of the scholarship at the disposal of the average layman. This has largely been done for the Norse sagas. William Morris has translated the "Heimskringla" into language which, while not exactly English, can nevertheless be understood without difficulty—which is more than can be said for his translation of "Beowulf,"—and which has a real, though affectedly archaic, beauty. Dasent has translated the "Younger Edda," the "Njala Saga," and the "Saga of Gisli the Outlaw." It is pleasant for Americans to feel that it was Longfellow who, in his "Saga of King Olaf," rendered one of the most striking of the old Norse tales into a great poem.

It is difficult to speak with anything like exactness of the relative ages of these primitive literatures. Doubtless in each case the earliest manuscripts that have come down to us are themselves based upon

far earlier ones, which have been destroyed, and doubtless, when they were first written down, the tales had themselves been recited, and during the course of countless recitations had been changed and added to and built upon, for a period of centuries. Sometimes, as in the "Song of Roland," we know at least in bare outline the historical incident which for some reason impressed the popular imagination until around it there grew up a great epic, of which the facts have been twisted completely out of shape. In other instances, as in the "Nibelungenlied," a tale, adaptable in its outlines to many different peoples, was adapted to the geography of a particular people, and to what that people at least thought was history; thus the Rhine becomes the great river of the "Nibelungenlied," and in the second part of the epic the revenge of Krimhild becomes connected with dim memories of Attila's vast and evanescent empire. The "Song of Roland" and the "Nibelungenlied" were much later than the earliest English, Norse, and Irish poems. Very roughly, it may perhaps be said that, in the earliest forms at which we can guess, the Irish sagas were produced, or at least were in healthy life, at about the time when "Beowulf" was a live saga, and two or three centuries or thereabout before the early Norse sagas took a shape which we would recognize as virtually akin to that they now have.

These Celtic sagas are conveniently, though somewhat artificially, arranged in cycles. In some ways

the most interesting of these is the Cuchulain cycle, although until very recently it was far less known than the Ossianic cycle—the cycle which tells of the deeds of Finn and the Fianna. The poems which tell of the mighty feats of Cuchulain, and of the heroes whose life-threads were interwoven with his, date back to a purely pagan Ireland—an Ireland cut off from all connection with the splendid and slowly dying civilization of Rome, an Ireland in which still obtained ancient customs that had elsewhere vanished even from the memory of man.

Thus the heroes of the Cuchulain sagas still fought in chariots driven each by a charioteer who was also the stanch friend and retainer of the hero. Now, at one time war chariots had held the first place in the armies of all the powerful empires in the lands adjoining the Mediterranean and stretching eastward beyond the Tigris. Strange African tribes had used them north and south of the Atlas Mountains. When the mighty, conquering kings of Egypt made their forays into Syria, and there encountered the Hittite hosts, the decisive feature in each battle was the shock between the hundreds of chariots arrayed on each side. The tyranny of Sisera rested on his nine hundred chariots of iron. The Homeric heroes were "tamers of horses," which were not ridden in battle, but driven in the war chariots. That mysterions people, the Etruscans, of whose race and speech we know nothing, originally fought in chariots. But in the period of Greek and Roman splendor the war chariot had already

passed away. It had seemingly never been characteristic of the wild Teuton tribes; but among the western Celts it lingered long. Cæsar encountered it among the hostile tribes when he made his famous raid into Britain; and in Ireland it lasted later still.

The customs of the heroes and people of the Erin of Cuchulain's time were as archaic as the chariots in which they rode to battle. The sagas contain a wealth of material for the historian. They show us a land where the men were herdsmen, tillers of the soil, hunters, bards, seers, but, above all, warriors. Erin was a world to herself. Her people at times encountered the peoples of Britain or of Continental Europe, whether in trade or in piracy; but her chief interest, her overwhelming interest, lay in what went on within her own borders. There was a high king of shadowy power, whose sway was vaguely recognized as extending over the island, but whose practical supremacy was challenged on every hand by whatever king or under-king felt the fierce whim seize him. There were chiefs and serfs; there were halls and fortresses; there were huge herds of horses and cattle and sheep and swine. The kings and queens, the great lords and their wives, the chiefs and the famous fighting men, wore garments crimson and blue and green and saffron, plain or checkered, and plaid and striped. They had rings and clasps and torques of gold and silver, urns and mugs and troughs and vessels of iron and silver. They played chess by the fires in their great halls, and they

feasted and drank and quarreled within them, and the women had sun-parlors of their own.

Among the most striking of the tales are those of the "Fate of the Sons of Usnach," telling of Deirdrè's life and love and her lamentation for her slain lover; of the "Wooing of Emer" by Cuchulain; of the "Feast of Bricriu"; and of the famous Cattle-Spoil of Cooley, the most famous romance of ancient Ireland, the story of the great raid for the Dun Bull of Cooley. But there are many others of almost equal interest; such as the story of MacDatho's pig, with its Gargantuan carouse of the quarrelsome champions; and the tale of the seige of Howth.

In these tales, which in so many points are necessarily like the similar tales that have come down from the immemorial past of the peoples of kindred race, there are also striking peculiarities that hedge them apart. The tales are found in many versions, which for the most part have been enlarged by pedantic scribes of after-time, who often made them prolix and tedious, and added grotesque and fantastic exaggerations of their own to the barbaric exaggerations already in them, doing much what Saxo Grammaticus did for the Scandinavian tales. They might have been woven into some great epic, or at least have taken far more definite and connected shape, if the history of Ireland had developed along lines similar to those of the other nations of west Europe. But her history was broken by terrible national tragedies and calamities. To the scourge

of the vikings succeeded the Anglo-Norman conquest, with all its ruinous effects on the growth of the national life. The early poems of the Erse bards could not develop as those other early lays developed which afterward became the romances of Arthur and Roland and Siegfried. They remain primitive, as "Beowulf" is primitive, as, in less measure, "Gisli the Outlaw" is primitive.

The heroes are much like those of the early folk of kindred stock everywhere. They are huge, splendid barbarians, sometimes yellow-haired, sometimes black or brown-haired, and their chief title to glory is found in their feats of bodily prowess. Among the feats often enumerated or referred to are the ability to leap like a salmon, to run like a stag, to hurl great rocks incredible distances, to toss the wheel, and, like the Norse berserkers, when possessed with the fury of battle, to grow demoniac with fearsome rage. This last feat was especially valued, and was recognized as the "heroes' fury." As with most primitive peoples, the power to shout loudly was much prized, and had a distinct place of respect, under the title of "mad roar," in any list of a given hero's exhibitions of strength or agility, just as Stentor's voice was regarded by his comrades as a valuable military asset. So, when the slaughter begins in Etzel's hall, the writer of the Nibelung lay dwells with admiration on the vast strength of Diederick, as shown by the way in which his voice rang like a bison horn, resounding within and without the walls. Many of the feasts chron-

icled of the early Erse heroes are now wholly unintelligible to us; we can not even be sure what they were, still less why they should have been admired.

Among the heroes stood the men of wisdom, as wisdom was in the early world, a vulpine wisdom of craft and cunning and treachery and double-dealing. Druids, warlocks, sorcerers, magicians, witches appear, now as friends, now as unfriends, of the men of might. Fiercely the heroes fought and wide they wandered; yet their fights and their wanderings were not very different from those that we read about in many other primitive tales. There is the usual incredible variety of incidents and character, and, together with the variety, an endless repetition. But these Erse tales differ markedly from the early Norse and Teutonic stories in more than one particular. A vein of the supernatural and a vein of the romantic run through them and relieve their grimness and harshness in a way very different from anything to be found in the Teutonic. Of course the supernatural element often takes as grim a form in early Irish as in early Norse or German; the Goddess with red eyebrows who on stricken fields wooed the Erse heroes from life did not differ essentially from the Valkyrie; and there were land and water demons in Ireland as terrible as those against which Beowulf warred. But, in addition, there is in the Irish tales an unearthliness free from all that is monstrous and horrible; and their unearthly creatures could become in after-time the

fairies of the moonlight and the greenwood, so different from the trolls and gnomes and misshapen giants bequeathed to later generations by the Norse mythology.

Still more striking is the difference between the women in the Irish sagas and those, for instance, of the Norse sagas. Their heirs of the spirit are the Arthurian heroines, and the heroines of the romances of the middle ages. In the "Song of Roland"—rather curiously, considering that it is the first great piece of French literature—woman plays absolutely no part at all; there is not a female figure which is more than a name, or which can be placed beside Roland and Oliver, Archbishop Turpin and the traitor Ganelon, and Charlemagne, the mighty emperor of the "barbe fleurie." The heroines of the early Norse and German stories are splendid and terrible, fit to be the mothers of a mighty race, as stern and relentless as their lovers and husbands. But it would be hard indeed to find among them a heroine who would appeal to our modern ideas as does Emer, the beloved of Cuchulain, or Deirdrè, the sweetheart of the fated son of Usnach. Emer and Deirdrè have the charm, the power of inspiring and returning romantic love, that belonged to the ladies whose lords were the knights of the Round Table, though of course this does not mean that they lacked some very archaic tastes and attributes.

Emer, the daughter of Forgall the Wily, who was wooed by Cuchulain, had the "six gifts of a girl"—beauty, and a soft voice, and sweet speech,

and wisdom, and needle-work, and chastity. In their wooing the hero and heroine spoke to one another in riddles, those delights of the childhood of peoples. She set him journeys to go and feats to perform, which he did in the manner of latter knights-errant. After long courting and many hardships, he took Emer to wife, and she was true to him and loved him and gloried in him and watched over him until the day he went out to meet his death. All this was in a spirit which we would find natural in a heroine of modern or of mediæval times—a spirit which it would be hard to match either among the civilizations of antiquity, or in early barbarisms other than the Erse.

So it was with Deirdrè, the beautiful girl who forsook her betrothed, the Over-King of Ulster, for the love of Naisi, and fled with him and his two brothers across the waters to Scotland. At last they returned to Ireland, and there Deirdrè's lover and his two brothers were slain by the treachery of the king whose guests they were. Many versions of the Songs of Deirdrè have come down to us, of her farewell to Alba, and her lament over her slain lover; for during centuries this tragedy of Deirdrè, together with the tragical fate of the Children of Lir and the tragical fate of the Children of Tuirenn, were known as the "Three Sorrowful Tales of Erin." None has better retained its vitality down to the present day. Even to us, reading the songs in an alien age and tongue, they are very beautiful. Deirdrè sings wistfully of her

Scottish abiding-place, with its pleasant, cuckoo-haunted groves, and its cliffs, and the white sand on the beaches. She tells of her lover's single infidelity, when he became enamored of the daughter of a Scottish lord, and Deirdrè, broken-hearted, put off to sea in a boat, indifferent whether she should live or die; whereupon the two brothers of her lover swam after her, and brought her back, to find him very repentant and swearing a three-fold oath that never again would he prove false to her until he should go to the hosts of the dead. She dwells constantly on the unfailing tenderness of the three heroes; for her lover's two brothers cared for her as he did:

> Much hardship would I take,
> Along with the three heroes;
> I would endure without house, without fire,
> It is not I that would be gloomy.
>
> Their three shields and their spears
> Were often a bed for me.
> Put their three hard swords
> Over the grave, O young man!

For the most part, in her songs, Deirdrè dwells on the glories and beauties of the three warriors, the three dragons, the three champions of the Red Branch, the three that used to break every onrush, the three hawks, the three darlings of the women of Erin, the three heroes who were not good at homage. She sings of their splendor in the foray, of their nobleness as they returned to their home,

to bring fagots for the fire, to bear in an ox or a boar for the table; sweet though the pipes and flutes and horns were in the house of the king, sweeter yet was it to hearken to the songs sung by the sons of Usnach, for "like the sound of the wave was the voice of Naisi."

There were other Irish heroines of a more common barbarian type. Such was the famous warrior queen, Meave, tall and beautiful, with her white face and yellow hair, terrible in her battle chariot when she drove at full speed into the press of fighting men, and "fought over the ears of the horses." Her virtues were those of a warlike barbarian king, and she claimed the like large liberty in morals. Her husband was Ailill, the Connaught king, and, as Meave carefully explained to him in what the old Erse bards called a "bolster conversation," their marriage was literally a partnership wherein she demanded from her husband an exact equality of treatment according to her own views and on her own terms; the three essential qualities upon which she insisted being that he should be brave, generous, and completely devoid of jealousy!

Fair-haired Queen Meave was a myth, a goddess, and her memory changed and dwindled until at last she reappeared as Queen Mab of fairyland. But among the ancient Celts her likeness was the likeness of many a historic warrior queen. The descriptions given of her by the first writers or compilers of the famous romances of the foray

for the Dun Bull of Cooley almost exactly match the descriptions given by the Latin historian of the British Queen Boadicea, tall and terrible-faced, her long, yellow hair flowing to her hips, spear in hand, golden collar on neck, her brightly colored mantle fastened across her breast with a brooch.

Not only were some of Meave's deeds of a rather startling kind, but even Emer and Deirdrè at times showed traits that to a modern reader may seem out of place, in view of what has been said of them above. But we must remember the surroundings, and think of what even the real women of history were, throughout European lands, until a far later period. In the "Heimskringla" we read of Queen Sigrid, the wisest of women, who grew tired of the small kings who came to ask her hand, a request which she did not regard them as warranted to make either by position or extent of dominion. So one day when two kings had thus come to woo her, she lodged them in a separate wooden house, with all their company, and feasted them until they were all very drunk, and fell asleep; then in the middle of the night she had her men fall on them with fire and sword, burn those who stayed within the hall, and slay those who broke out. The incident is mentioned in the saga without the slightest condemnation; on the contrary, it evidently placed the queen on a higher social level than before, for, in concluding the account, the saga mentions that Sigrid said "that she would weary these small

kings of coming from other lands to woo her; so she was called Sigrid Haughty thereafter." Now, Sigrid was a historical character who lived many hundred years after the time of Emer and Deirdrè and Meave, and the simplicity with which her deed was chronicled at the time, and regarded afterward, should reconcile us to some of the feats recorded of those shadowy Erse predecessors of hers, who were separated from her by an interval of time as great as that which separates her from us.

The story of the "Feast of Bricriu of the Bitter Tongue" is one of the most interesting of the tales of the Cuchulain cycle. In all this cycle of tales, Bricriu appears as the cunning, malevolent mischief-maker, dreaded for his biting satire and his power of setting by the ears the boastful, truculent, reckless, and marvelously short-tempered heroes among whom he lived. He has points of resemblance to Thersites, to Sir Kay, of the Arthurian romances, and to Conan, of the Ossianic cycle of Celtic sagas. This story is based upon the custom of the "champion's portion," which at a feast was allotted to the bravest man. It was a custom which lasted far down into historic times, and was recognized in the Brehon laws, where a heavy fine was imposed upon any person who stole it from the one to whom it belonged. The story in its present form, like all of these stories, is doubtless somewhat changed from the story as it was originally recited among the pre-Christian Celts of Ireland,

but it still commemorates customs of the most primitive kind, many of them akin to those of all the races of Aryan tongue in their earlier days. The queens cause their maids to heat water for the warriors' baths when they return from war, and similarly made ready to greet their guests, as did the Homeric heroines. The feasts were Homeric feasts. The heroes boasted and sulked and fought as did the Greeks before Troy. At their feasts, when the pork and beef, the wheaten cakes and honey, had been eaten, and the beer, and sometimes the wine of Gaul, had been drunk in huge quantities, the heroes, vainglorious and quarrelsome, were always apt to fight. Thus in the three houses which together made up the palace of the high king at Emain Macha, it was necessary that the arms of the heroes should all be kept in one place, so that they could not attack one another at the feasts. These three houses of the palace were the Royal House, in which the high king himself had his bronzed and jeweled room; the Speckled House, where the swords, the shields, and the spears of the heroes were kept; and the House of the Red Branch, where not only the weapons, but the heads of the beaten enemies were stored; and it was in connection with this last gruesome house that the heroes in the train of the High King Conchubar took their name of the "Heroes of the Red Branch."

When Bricriu gave his feast, he prepared for it by building a spacious house even handsomer

than the House of the Red Branch; and it is described in great detail, as fashioned after "Tara's Mead Hall," and of great strength and magnificence; and it was stocked with quilts and blankets and beds and pillows, as well as with abundance of meat and drink. Then he invited the high king and all the nobles of Ulster to come to the feast. An amusing touch in the saga is the frank consternation of the heroes who were thus asked. They felt themselves helpless before the wiles of Bricriu, and at first refused outright to go, because they were sure that he would contrive to set them to fighting with one another; and they went at all only after they had taken hostage from Bricriu and had arranged that he should himself leave the feast-hall as soon as the feast was spread. But their precautions were in vain, and Bricriu had no trouble in bringing about a furious dispute among the three leading chiefs, Loigaire the Triumphant, Conall the Victorious, and Cuchulain. He promised to each the champion's portion, on condition that each should claim it. Nor did he rest here, but produced what the saga calls "the war of words of the women of Ulster," by persuading the three wives of the three heroes that each should tread first into the banquet hall. Each of the ladies, in whose minds he thus raised visions of social precedence, had walked away from the palace with half a hundred women in her train, when they all three met. The saga describes how they started to return to the hall together, walking evenly,

gracefully, and easily at first, and then with quicker steps, until, when they got near the house, they raised their robes "to the round of the leg" and ran at full speed. When they got to the hall the doors were shut, and, as they stood outside, each wife chanted her own perfections, but, above all, the valor and ferocious prowess of her husband, scolding one another as did Brunhild and Krimhild in the quarrel that led to Siegfried's death at the hands of Hagen. Each husband, as in duty bound, helped his wife into the hall, and the bickering which had already taken place about the champion's portion was renewed. At last it was settled that the three rivals should drive in their chariots to the home of Ailill and Meave, who should adjudge between them; and the judgment given, after testing their prowess in many ways, and especially in encounters with demons and goblins, was finally in favor of Cuchulain.

One of the striking parts of the tale is that in which the three champions, following one another, arrive at the palace of Meave. The daughter of Meave goes to the sun-parlor over the high porch of the hold, and from there she is told by the queen to describe in turn each chariot and the color of the horses and how the hero looks and how the chariot courses. The girl obeys, and describes in detail each chariot as it comes up, and the queen in each case recognizes the champion from the description and speaks words of savage praise of each in turn. Loigaire, a fair man, driving two

fiery dapple grays, in a wicker-work chariot with silver-mounted yoke, is chanted by the queen as:

"A fury of war, a fire of judgment,
A flame of vengeance; in mien a hero,
In face a champion, in heart a dragon;
The long knife of proud victories which will hew us to pieces,
The all-noble, red-handed Loigaire."

Conall is described as driving a roan and a bay, in a chariot with two bright wheels of bronze, he himself fair, in face white and red, his mantle blue and crimson, and Meave describes him as:

"A wolf among cattle; battle on battle,
Exploit on exploit, head upon head he heaps;"

and says that if he is excited to rage he will cut up her people

"As a trout on red sandstone is cut."

Then Cuchulain is described, driving at a gallop a dapple gray and a dark gray, in a chariot with iron wheels and a bright silver pole. The hero himself is a dark, melancholy man, the comeliest of the men of Erin, in a crimson tunic, with gold-hilted sword, a blood-red spear, and over his shoulders a crimson shield rimmed with silver and gold. Meave, on hearing the description, chants the hero as:

"An ocean in fury, a whale that rageth, a fragment of flame and fire;

"A bear majestic, a grandly moving billow,
A beast in maddening ire:
In the crash of glorious battle through the hostile foe he leaps,
His shout the fury of doom;
A terrible bear, he is death to the herd of cattle,
Feat upon feat, head upon head he heaps:
Laud ye the hearty one, he who is victor fully."

Bricriu lost his life as a sequel of the great raid for the Dun Bull of Cooley. This was undertaken by Queen Meave as the result of the "bolster conversation," the curtain quarrel, between her and Ailill as to which of the two, husband or wife, had the more treasures. To settle the dispute, they compared their respective treasures beginning with their wooden and iron vessels, going on with their rings and bracelets and brooches and fine clothes, and ending with their flocks of sheep, and herds of swine, horses, and cattle. The tally was even for both sides until they came to the cattle, when it appeared that Ailill had a huge, white-horned bull with which there was nothing of Meave's to compare. The chagrined queen learned from a herald that in Cooley there was a dun or brown bull which, it was asserted, was even larger and more formidable.

Meave announces that by fair means or foul the dun bull shall be hers, and she raises her hosts. A great war ensues, in which Cuchulain distinguishes himself above all others. All the heroes gather to the fight, and a special canto is devoted to the fate

of a very old man, Iliach, a chief of Ulster, who resolves to attack the foe and to avenge Ulster's honor on them. "Whether, then, I fall or come out of it, is all one," he said. The saga tells how his withered and wasted old horses, which fed on the shore by his little fort, were harnessed to the ancient chariot, which had long lost its cushions. Into it he got, mother-naked, with his sword and his pair of blunt, rusty spears, and great throwing-stones heaped at his feet; and thus he attacked the hosts of Meave and fought till his death. In the Cuchulain sagas the heroes frequently fight with stones; and the practice obtained until much later days, for in Olof's death battle with the ships of Hakon his men were cleared from the decks of the "Long Serpent" by dexterously hurled stones as well as by spears.

Partly by cunning, Meave gets the dun bull upon which she had set her heart. Then comes in a thoroughly Erse touch. It appears that the two bulls have lived many lives in different forms, and always in hostility to each other, since the days when their souls were the souls of two swineherds, who quarreled and fought to the death. Now the two great bulls renew their ancient fight. Bricriu is forced out to witness it, and is trampled to death by the beasts. At last the white-horned bull is slain, and the dun, raging and destroying, goes back to his home, where he, too, dies. And this, says the saga, in ending, is the tale of the Dun Bull of Cooley and the Driving of the

Cattle-Herd by Meave and Ailill, and their war with Ulster.

The Erse tales have suffered from many causes. Taken as a mass, they did not develop as the sagas and the epics of certain other nations developed; but they possess extraordinary variety and beauty, and in their mysticism, their devotion to and appreciation of natural beauty, their exaltation of the glorious courage of men and of the charm and devotion of women, in all the touches that tell of a long-vanished life, they possess a curious attraction of their own. They deserve the research which can be given only by the life-long effort of trained scholars; they should be studied for their poetry, as countless scholars have studied those early literatures; moreover, they should be studied as Victor Bérard has studied the "Odyssey," for reasons apart from their poetical worth; and finally they deserve to be translated and adapted so as to become a familiar household part of that literature which all the English-speaking people possess in common.

MESSAGE COMMUNICATED TO THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS, FEBRUARY 13, 1907

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I call your attention to the urgent need of legislation affecting the different phases of the public-land situation in the United States. In the first place I wish to speak of the conservation of the mineral fuels belonging to the United States. In

my annual message of December 4, 1906, and special message of December 17, your attention was called to the importance of conserving the supplies of mineral fuels still belonging to the Government. I recommended to Congress the enactment of such legislation as would provide for title to and development of the surface land as separate and distinct from the right to the underlying mineral fuels in regions where these may occur, and the disposal of these mineral fuels under a leasing system on conditions which would inure to the benefit of the public as a whole. I again call the attention of Congress to the importance of enacting such legislation. I care little for the details; the prime need is that the system should be established, and that from henceforth the Nation should retain its title to its fuel resources and its right to supervise their development in the interest of the public as a whole. Such a leasing system as that proposed represents by no means an untried policy. In the Australian countries during the last fifteen years coal has been mined under a system of government leases, and on conditions so favorable for development that their coal and coke are to-day being sold on the Pacific Coast of both the American continents. In all the great coal-producing European countries, except Great Britain, coal is being mined under government leases. In Great Britain leases are granted almost entirely by the private landowners, but there, as in other countries, the surface culture and the mining operations are conducted inde-

pendently of each other. In Nova Scotia, British Columbia, India, and other British colonies a government leasing system has been adopted, and is working satisfactorily. In the United States, although conveyance of the mineral rights with the surface has been the common practice, the separate development of the two interests is increasing; and in the Eastern and Middle States a large part of the coal is being mined under a system of private leases. It is gratifying to note that in these States, as in foreign countries, these two great industries —agriculture and mining—are conducted within the same boundaries, and the country thus attains its highest dual development without conflict of interests. Indeed, the mining industry, and the factories using these fuels, create larger local markets for the products of the farm.

Mineral fuels, like the forests and navigable streams, should be treated as public utilities. This is generally recognized abroad. In some foreign countries practical control of a large portion of the fuel resources was allowed years ago to pass into private hands, but the existing governments are endeavoring to regain this control in order that the diminishing fuel supply may be safeguarded for the common good, instead of being disposed of for the benefit of the few—though the mistake of the preceding generation in disposing of these fuels for a nominal return can not always be corrected by the present generation, as the cost may be so enormous as to be prohibitory.

In our own Western States and Territories the scarcity of both water and forests has rendered necessary their preservation as public utilities; and the preservation of the forests for the purpose of conserving both the waters and the timber supply has come to be recognized as the wise and proper policy of the Federal Government.

The quantity of high-grade mineral fuels in the West is relatively much smaller than that of the forests, and the proper conservation of these fuels is a matter of far-reaching importance. This Government should not now repeat the mistakes of the past. Let us not do what the next generation can not undo. We have a right to the proper use of both the forests and the fuel during our lifetime, but we should not dispose of the birthright of our children. If this Government sells its remaining fuel lands they pass out of its future control. If it now leases them we retain control, and a future Congress will be at liberty to decide whether it will continue or change this policy. Meanwhile, the Government can inaugurate a system which will encourage the separate and independent development of the surface lands for agricultural purposes and the extraction of the mineral fuels in such manner as will best meet the needs of the people and best facilitate the development of manufacturing industries.

I am aware that objections to this system are being urged. It is claimed that so large a part of the coal in some of the Western States has already passed into the hands of certain large corporations

that parties endeavoring to operate under a lease system other coal deposits would be unable to compete with these corporations, and therefore that the fuel deposits still belonging to the Government should also be allowed to pass into private ownership, presumably into the hands of the same or other large corporations. It is also claimed that reservation of the fuel supplies still belonging to the Government would raise the price of coal in the West, and, as an argument in favor of this contention, it is claimed that the reservation of the natural forests is raising the price of lumber in the West. It should be remembered that the best and most accessible bodies of timber in the West passed into private holdings before the forest reserves were established; that while the price of timber has advanced in the West, it has advanced still more in the East, where there are no forest reserves; that supplies of timber are to-day being shipped from the West to the markets of the Mississippi Valley, and even to foreign countries; and that the probability of obtaining future supplies of both timber and mineral fuel in the West at reasonable prices will be much greater with a large portion of both the forests and the fuels under the control of the Government than if this control should pass to private parties. To secure cheapness of timber and fuel for the moment at the cost of ruin to our own children would surely be a suicidal policy.

It may be fairly claimed among the advantages of the leasing system that: (1) It will facilitate the

working, under favorable conditions, of coal deposits for local markets by miners without large capital, as no land-purchase money would be required and the small royalty charges would be paid out of the earnings; (2) it will facilitate larger operations, as the leases could be made sufficiently liberal in the matter of time, area, and other conditions to induce healthy competition and meet all real demands; and yet in all cases the general supervision of the Government could be such as to (3) prevent waste in the extraction and handling of these fuels; (4) the system can be operated in such manner as to prevent the evils of monopolistic control; (5) it will permit the Government to reserve from general use fuels especially suitable for metallurgical and other special industries; and (6) it will enable the Government to protect the public against unreasonable and discriminating charges for fuel supplies.

Already probably one-half of the total area of the high-grade coals in the West has passed under private control. Including both the lignite and the coal areas, these private holdings probably aggregate not less than 30,000,000 acres of coal fields. With the remainder of the lands containing mineral fuels reserved and leased by the Government, there will be ample opportunity to determine, in the near future, which of the two systems—private ownership or the leasing system with General Government supervision—will best protect the interests of the people and thus promote the permanent development of the West.

In planning such a leasing system by the Government, the question of revenue, beyond that necessary to cover the expenses of administration and exploration, need not be seriously considered. The spirit of generosity which the country as a whole has shown in connection with the disposal of its public lands and the use of the proceeds from the sale of these lands for the further development of the West through the Reclamation Service and in other ways, is of itself a sufficient guaranty that in the administration of both the coal reserves and the national forests this generous policy will be continued. It is safe to believe also that Federal supervision of both the coal lands and the forests will be reduced to a minimum, and that in the future even more than in the past this supervision will be limited to that necessary to carry out the policy of conserving these natural resources in such manner as will best promote the permanent interests of the people, and above all of the Western people, of the people in the neighborhood of the mines and the forests which we seek to preserve for the public use.

The necessity for care in the future management of these fuel supplies is further illustrated by the rapid rate at which the use of such fuels is increasing in the United States. The amount of coal used in this country during the last ten years is practically equal to that used during the preceding fifty years of its history, and during each decade of this period the coal used was practically equal to the sum of that used during all the preceding decades.

7272

This remarkable development and the certain continuity of this prodigious growth compels us to recast all estimates as to the life of our "inexhaustible resources." We can foresee the time when the eastern industries will be much more largely taxed for supplying foreign markets. Then the West will also be largely engaged in varied manufacturing enterprises; and this will require the intelligent use of every ton of available fuel in that region. The grave importance of conserving the fuel supplies in the West still remaining under the control of the Government, with a view to the accomplishment of these important purposes, impels me again to bring this matter to the attention of Congress.

Let me repeat that what I seek at this time is that the system be begun. I know the difficulty of providing in minute detail by legislation for all the needs in advance. I have the heartiest sympathy with the desire of the people of the new States of the Rocky Mountain region for the rapid development of the lusty young commonwealths of which they are so proud. So far from hindering, I want to further that development. But surely it is to the peculiar interest of these States that the development shall take place in such way as to leave the children better off, and not worse off, than the fathers. Let us use, but not waste, the national resources. Let us show our confidence in the future by being willing to provide for the future. If we dispose of all the coal lands now, we can be well assured that twenty-five years hence the generation

then coming to manhood will regret our shortsightedness and lack of provision for the future. It would surely be greatly to the advantage of this country if some at least of the coal fields of the East, and especially of the anthracite fields, had been left under the control of the Government. Let us provide in the West against the recurrence of the conditions which we deplore in the East. At the outset the law would be administered in a spirit of the broadest liberality, with the least possible interference with the development of the coal fields. What is especially necessary is to establish the principle so that as conditions change there will be opportunity to meet the changing need in adequate fashion. Moreover, I can not too emphatically say that all laws which merely seek to prevent monopoly or the mishandling of the public by forbidding combination are certain to fail of their purpose. Our experience with the interstate commerce and anti-trust laws shows that what is needed is not prohibition of all combinations, but such supervision and control over combinations, and over corporations entering into them, as will prevent the evils while giving to the public the advantages of combination.

Let me also again urge that legislation be passed to provide for Government control of the public pasture lands of the West on the same general principles which now apply in the Government control of the forest reserves. The local control of the range should be in the hands of Western men fa-

miliar with stock raising, and there should be full local participation in the management of the range, for co-operation between the stockmen and the Government officers is absolutely essential. The grazing fee should be small and at first almost nominal. There is no need at present that the Government should get a net revenue from grazing on the public range, but only enough to pay for administration and improvement, and it may be wise to provide that any surplus shall go to the States and Territories in which the fees are collected. If a law for the control of the range should, as I request, be enacted, such control would not be taken hurriedly, but gradually, as grazing districts can be organized. The one prime essential in the policy of range control must be to protect the homesteader in his right to create a home for his family. The right of the homesteader, of the home maker, of the actual settler on the land, must always be paramount, and he must have whatever range privileges are necessary to his purpose. At present it is unlawful to fence the public domain. All fences unlawfully maintained will have to be taken down. Unless Congress takes action to legalize reasonable and necessary fencing through Government control of the range, there will be serious loss to stockmen through the West, and this loss will often fall hardest on the small man; for, in many cases, the stock business can not be conducted without fences. Yet it would be grossly improper to provide for the continuance of all the present illegal fencing; for,

while much of this fencing is needed, much of it also represents a fraud upon the public. What is needed is not to provide for the continuance of all fencing, whether beneficial or harmful, but a proper discrimination between the two classes—a discrimination to be exercised always with especial care for the interests of the homesteader and the small stockman. The interests of the man who has actually made his home or is actually seeking to make his home on the land, whether he owns cattle or owns sheep, are really identical with those of the homesteader. The opposition to the measure comes primarily from those who do not make their homes on the land, but who own wandering bands of sheep that are driven hither and thither to eat out the land and render it worthless for the real home maker; and also from the men who have already obtained control of great areas of the public land largely through the ownership or leasing of water at what might be called the "strategic points of the range," and who object to the proposed law for the very reason that it is in the interest of the actual homesteader and the small stockman, and because it will break the control that these few big men now have over the lands which they do not actually own. The proposed law is emphatically a law in the interest of popular rights. The present system in an immense number of cases renders it impossible for the small man to exist; and it works chiefly for the benefit of the very rich man whose interest it is to keep out home makers and preserve immense

stretches of the public domain for his own use, to the detriment of the development of the Commonwealth. Surely it is in accordance with the spirit of our Government to pass a law in the interest of the actual settler, instead of to leave undisturbed the present system in the interest of those who monopolize an improper proportion of the public domain, or of the others who are indifferent as to whether in the long run they destroy the worth of the public domain.

As in the case of the proposed law for controlling the disposition of the mineral fuels, our object should be to get the principle of the law established, leaving a necessary discretion to those who at the outset are to administer it, and then to perfect the law later, as actual experience may show the need.

Let me urge that Congress provide $500,000, in addition to the present estimates, to be immediately applied to the clearing of the arrears of business in the General Land Office, as regards the detection and prevention of fraud in disposing of applications for patents to the public lands.

I wish to express my utter and complete dissent from the statements that have been made as to there being but a minimum of fraud in the actual working of our present land laws. I am exceedingly anxious to protect the interests of bonâ fide settlers and to prevent hardship being inflicted upon them. But surely we are working in their interests when we try to prevent the land which should be re-

served for them and for those like them from being taken possession of for speculative purposes or obtained in any fraudulent fashion. The funds appropriated by Congress to protect public lands from illegal entry or unlawful appropriation have been utterly insufficient to keep pace with the vast amount of public-land business. For this reason the natural sympathy of the Administration with bonâ fide claimants and the proper desire to further their interests have led to the use of almost all of this appropriation, not for the detection and prevention of fraud, but for the purpose of hastening the routine hearing and office inspection of final proof. If sufficient money is not now granted to enable the Administration both to protect the interests of bonâ fide claimants and at the same time to hunt out the fraudulent ones, then the responsibility for the delays which will necessarily occur or for the fraud which will obtain can not rest upon the Administration. The great number of fraudulent cases which our lack of means forces us to leave undetected brings deep discredit on the public-land system of the country, and it does not seem to me that there can be any apology for the Government's failure to provide ample means for their detection and to insist upon the means being so used as to guarantee their detection, and this can only be done if an ample force of inspectors is furnished, so that each entry may be inspected upon the ground or adequate information obtained about it that will satisfy us that the land is being taken in accordance

with law. It is not true that any very long time will be needed for such inspection. With the amount provided for which I have asked, the arrears of the work will be brought up within a year, and thereafter the work can be kept up by a continually diminishing appropriation.

The present force of special agents is utterly insufficient to conduct the proper field examinations. But there have been here and there a limited number of such field examinations in which direct investigation by Government officials was added to the evidence furnished by claimants. Four specific examples of these field examinations are as follows (I omit the names of the places):

(*a*) Examination of desert-land entries during August, September, and October, 1906:

Agents assigned	11
Total days' examination on the ground	484
Entries examined	1,159
Claims examined per day per agent	2.4
Unfavorably reported.....per cent....	41
Relinquished .....do.....	5
Favorably reported.....do.....	54

(*b*) Homestead entries examined during October and November, 1905:

Agents assigned	23
Total days' examination on the ground	300
Entries examined	900
Claims per day per agent	2
Unfavorably reported.....per cent....	46
Relinquished.....do.....	10
Favorably reported.....do.....	44

(*c*) Homestead entries:

Entries examined	110
Unfavorably reported.....per cent....	63.7
Favorably reported.....do.....	36.3

(During the past year 50 additional claims have been relinquished.)

Entries examined		107
Unfavorably reported	per cent...	67.3
Canceled on relinquishment	do.....	10.2
Canceled for other causes	do.....	6.5
Favorably reported	do.....	16

Summarizing the results, it appears that in these four districts nearly 2,300 cases were examined and that in over half the law had not been complied with, the failure being in each case on some essential feature and in very many cases showing deliberate fraud. In six months ending December 31 last our present insufficient force of special agents secured indictments in 197 actions for fraud, 26 of which have been tried, resulting in 14 convictions and 12 acquittals. In the forest reserves, where we have been able to examine a great number of claims, in about one-third the law was not complied with.

In the Susanville and Sacramento, Cal., placer mining claims it was discovered that one man with fourteen associates had attempted to get possession of 250,000 acres, including much of the finest timber land in the region, by locating placer claims upon it. Three agents on this ground examined 25,000 acres of claims and reported unfavorably upon over 24,000 of them, with the result that up to date, because of this investigation, 36,000 acres were relinquished and restored to Governmental ownership while the investigation was still in progress, an amount considerably in excess of the amount actually investigated.

While the above cases, of course, show worse

results than would be shown by examinations made at random, they are nevertheless by no means unusual, save, perhaps, in the case of the placer-claims investigation. Surely such a showing renders it impossible to say that there is no fraud, and therefore no need of striving to detect and prevent fraud. On the contrary, there is urgent need for such effort in the interest not only of the honest observance of the law, but in the interest of honest and bonâ fide settlers. Without sufficient money it is impossible to execute the land laws in reasonably prompt and efficient fashion. The business of the Land Office, because of lack of appropriations, is far behind. To protect the public property no less than to relieve the land claimants, enough money should be given for the purposes I have outlined above, and the appropriation should be made immediately available. Unless such money is given then either honest claimants must suffer hardship or wrong-doers must be permitted to be the beneficiaries of their fraudulent and illegal acts. From the standpoint of the public interest failure to prevent fraud of this kind is peculiarly serious, because in so many cases the success of the fraudulent claimants means the prevention of the establishment of a home by some honest home seeker. The earnest wish of the Administration is to discontinue the advertisement of fraud in connection with the public-land system; but the only way to accomplish this is by putting a stop to the fraud itself.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
February 16, 1907.

MY DEAR SIR:

It is with regret that I must refuse your kind invitation to be present and speak at your annual banquet.

I have noted with pleasure the good work which your association has done in promoting playgrounds for the National Capital. I am especially pleased with the prospect of Congress granting this year an appropriation for the purchase of playground sites. I trust that the bill of Representative Boutell will also go through so that you may be able to secure sites in the various quarters of the city now while open spaces still exist and before the price upon them becomes prohibitive. The plan of playground development for the District has been so carefully drawn that I hope it may be carried out substantially as outlined. I regard this as one of the most important steps toward making Washington the model city which we all feel that the capital of this Nation should be.

I have been pleased to see also that there is a new interest in play and playgrounds all over the country, and that many cities that have not previously taken up the movement in a systematic way have made a beginning this year. The annual meeting of the Playground Association of America in Chicago, in June, with its attractive play festival and comprehensive study of play problems, is sure to increase this interest. I trust that all of our

larger municipalities will send representatives to this exhibition to gain inspiration from this meeting and to see the magnificent system that Chicago has erected in their South Park section, one of the most notable civic achievements of any American city.

The new appreciation of the value of play in the development of children is shown in many ways. The physical trainers in all of their recent meetings have put a new emphasis on the importance of play and are giving a larger place to it in their work. The Public School Athletic League of New York has organized athletics along sane and helpful lines for thousands of school-children, and a number of other cities seem to be about to take up this movement. There is a general feeling in our schools and colleges also for larger athletic fields and the participation of a larger proportion of the students in athletic events. In Germany a large number of games have been put into the school course as a part of the school system, thus extending the method of the kindergarten through the elementary school. In England football and cricket have been a part of the school course at Eton, Rugby, and most of the other public and preparatory schools for many years. In the private schools of this country similar to these English schools, such as Lawrenceville, Groton, St. Paul's, and many others, play is also provided for in the curriculum. I hope that soon all of our public schools will provide, in connection with the school buildings and during school hours, the place and time for the recreation

as well as study of the children. Play is at present almost the only method of physical development for city children, and we must provide facilities for it if we would have the children strong and law-abiding. We have raised the age at which the child may go to work and increased the number of school years. These changes involve increased expense for parents with decreased return from the child. If we do not allow the children to work we must provide some other place than the streets for their leisure time. If we are to require the parents to rear the children at increased expense for the service of the state, practically without return, the state should make the care of children as easy and pleasant as possible. If we would have our citizens contented and law-abiding, we must not sow the seed of discontent in childhood by denying children their birthright of play.

City streets are unsatisfactory playgrounds for children because of the danger, because most good games are against the law, because they are too hot in summer, and because in crowded sections of the city they are apt to be schools of crime. Neither do small back yards nor ornamental grass plots meet the needs of any but the very small children. Older children who would play vigorous games must have places especially set aside for them; and, since play is a fundamental need, playgrounds should be provided for every child as much as schools. This means that they must be distributed over the cities in such a way as to be within walk-

ing distance of every boy and girl, as most children can not afford to pay carfare. In view of these facts cities should secure available spaces at once so that they may not need to demolish blocks of buildings in order to make playgrounds, as New York has had to do at a cost of nearly $1,000,000 an acre.

Neither must any city believe that simply to furnish open spaces will secure the best results. There must be supervision of these playgrounds, otherwise the older and stronger children occupy them to the exclusion of the younger and weaker ones; they are so noisy that people living in the neighborhood are annoyed; they are apt to get into the possession of gangs and become the rendezvous of the most undesirable elements of the population; the exercise and play is less systematic and vigorous when without supervision; and moreover, in all cities where the experiment has been tried, it has been found that such playgrounds are not well attended.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

MR. CUNO. H. RUDOLPH, President,
Washington Playground Association.

AT THE HARVARD UNION, FEBRUARY 23, 1907

In speaking here at the Harvard Union I wish to say first a special word as one Harvard man to his fellow Harvard men. I feel that we can none of us ever be sufficiently grateful to Colonel Higginson for having founded this Harvard Union,

because each loyal Harvard man should do all he can to foster in Harvard that spirit of real democracy which will make Harvard men feel the vital sense of solidarity so that they can all join to work together in the things that are of most concern to the college. It is idle to expect, nor indeed would it be desirable that there should be, in Harvard a uniform level of taste and association. Some men will excel in one thing and some in another; some in things of the body, some in things of the mind; and where thousands are gathered together each will naturally find some group of specially congenial friends with whom he will form ties of peculiar social intimacy. These groups—athletic, artistic, scientific, social—must inevitably exist. My plea is not for their abolition. My plea is that they shall be got into the right focus in the eyes of college men; that the relative importance of the different groups shall be understood when compared with the infinitely greater life of the college as a whole. Let each man have his special associates, his special interests, his special studies and pursuits, but let him remember that he can not get the full benefit of life in college if he does nothing but specialize; and that, what is even more important, he can not do his full duty by the college unless his first and greatest interest is in the college itself, in his associates taken as a mass, and not in any small group. One reason why I so thoroughly believe in the athletic spirit at Harvard is because the athletic spirit is essentially democratic. Our chief interest should

not lie in the great champions in sport. On the contrary, our concern should be most of all to widen the base, the foundation in athletic sports; to encourage in every way a healthy rivalry which shall give to the largest possible number of students the chance to take part in vigorous outdoor games. It is of far more importance that a man shall play something himself, even if he plays it badly, than that he shall go with hundreds of companions to see some one else play well; and it is not healthy for either students or athletes if the terms are mutually exclusive. But even having this aim especially in view, it seems to me we can best attain it by giving proper encouragement to the champions in the sports, and this can only be done by encouraging intercollegiate sport. As I emphatically disbelieve in seeing Harvard or any other college turn out mollycoddles instead of vigorous men, I may add that I do not in the least object to a sport because it is rough. Rowing, baseball, lacrosse, track and field games, hockey, football are all of them good. Moreover, it is to my mind simple nonsense, a mere confession of weakness, to desire to abolish a game because tendencies show themselves, or practices grow up, which prove that the game ought to be reformed. Take football, for instance. The preparatory schools are able to keep football clean and to develop the right spirit in the players without the slightest necessity ever arising to so much as consider the question of abolishing it. There is no excuse whatever for colleges failing to show the

same capacity, and there is no real need for considering the question of the abolition of the game. If necessary, let the college authorities interfere to stop any excess or perversion, making their interference as little officious as possible, and yet as rigorous as is necessary to achieve the end. But there is no justification for stopping a thoroughly manly sport because it is sometimes abused, when the experience of every good preparatory school shows that the abuse is in no shape necessarily attendant upon the game.

We can not afford to turn out of college men who shrink from physical effort or from a little physical pain. In any republic courage is a prime necessity for the average citizen if he is to be a good citizen; and he needs physical courage no less than moral courage, the courage that dares as well as the courage that endures, the courage that will fight valiantly alike against the foes of the soul and the foes of the body. Athletics are good, especially in their rougher forms, because they tend to develop such courage. They are good also because they encourage a true democratic spirit; for in the athletic field the man must be judged not with reference to outside and accidental attributes, but to that combination of bodily vigor and moral quality which go to make up prowess.

I trust I need not add that in defending athletics I would not for one moment be understood as excusing that perversion of athletics which would make it the end of life instead of merely a means

in life. It is first-class healthful play, and is useful as such. But play is not business, and it is a very poor business indeed for a college man to learn nothing but sport. There are exceptional cases which I do not need to consider; but disregarding these, I can not with sufficient emphasis say that when you get through college you will do badly unless you turn your attention to the serious work of life with a devotion which will render it impossible for you to pay much heed to sport in the way in which it is perfectly proper for you to pay heed while in college. Play while you play and work while you work; and though play is a mighty good thing, remember that you had better never play at all than to get into a condition of mind where you regard play as the serious business of life, or where you permit it to hamper and interfere with your doing your full duty in the real work of the world.

A word also to the students. Athletics are good; study is even better; and best of all is the development of the type of character for the lack of which, in an individual as in a nation, no amount of brilliancy of mind or of strength of body will atone. Harvard must do more than produce students; yet, after all, she will fall immeasurably short of her duty and her opportunity unless she produces a great number of true students, of true scholars. Moreover, let the students remember that in the long run in the field of study judgment must be rendered upon the quantity of first-class work produced in the way of productive scholarship, and

that no amount of second-class work can atone for failure in the college to produce this first-class work. A course of study is of little worth if it tends to deaden individual initiative and cramp scholars so that they only work in the ruts worn deep by many predecessors. American scholarship will be judged, not by the quantity of routine work produced by routine workers, but by the small amount of first-class output of those who, in whatever branch, stand in the first rank. No industry in compilation and in combination will ever take the place of this first-hand original work, this productive and creative work, whether in science, in art, in literature. The greatest special function of a college, as distinguished from its general function of producing good citizenship, should be so to shape conditions as to put a premium upon the development of productive scholarship, of the creative mind, in any form of intellectual work. The men whose chief concern lies with the work of the student in study should bear this fact ever before them.

So much for what I have to say to you purely as Harvard men. Now, a word which applies to you merely as it applies to all college men, to all men in this country who have received the benefits of a college education; and what I have to say on this topic can properly be said under the auspices of your Political Club. You here when you graduate will take up many different kinds of work; but there is one work in which all of you should take part simply as good American

citizens, and that is the work of self-government. Remember, in the first place, that to take part in the work of government does not in the least mean of necessity to hold office. It means to take an intelligent, disinterested, and practical part in the every-day duties of the average citizen, of the citizen who is not a faddist or a doctrinaire, but who abhors corruption and dislikes inefficiency; who wishes to see decent government prevail at home, with genuine equality of opportunity for all men so far as it can be brought about; and who wishes, as far as foreign matters are concerned, to see this Nation treat all other nations, great and small, with respect, and if need be with generosity, and at the same time show herself able to protect herself by her own might from any wrong at the hands of any outside Power.

Each man here should feel that he has no excuse, as a citizen in a democratic republic like ours, if he fails to do his part in the government. It is not only his right so to do, but his duty; his duty both to the Nation and to himself. Each should feel that, if he fails in this, he is not only failing in his duty but is showing himself in a contemptible light. A man may neglect his political duties because he is too lazy, too selfish, too short-sighted, or too timid; but whatever the reason may be it is certainly an unworthy reason, and it shows either a weakness or worse than a weakness in the man's character. Above all, you college men, remember that if your education, the pleasant lives you lead, make you too

fastidious, too sensitive to take part in the rough hurly-burly of the actual work of the world, if you become so over-cultivated, so over-refined that you can not do the hard work of practical politics, then you had better never have been educated at all. The weakling and the coward are out of place in a strong and free community. In a republic like ours the governing class is composed of the strong men who take the trouble to do the work of government; and if you are too timid or too fastidious or too careless to do your part in this work, then you forfeit your right to be considered one of the governing and you become one of the governed instead—one of the driven cattle of the political arena. I want you to feel that it is not merely your right to take part in politics, not merely your duty to the state, but that it is demanded by your own self-respect, unless you are content to acknowledge that you are unfit to govern yourself and have to submit to the rule of somebody else as a master—and this is what it means if you do not do your own part in government.

As soon as I left college I wanted to take an interest in political life; I wanted to find out how the work of governing was really done. Quite a number of nice people in New York, along Fifth Avenue, solemnly advised me not to join any of the regular political organizations, because I would find that they were composed only of "muckers," not of "gentlemen." The answer was easy: "Then they are the ones that govern; if it is the muckers

that govern, I want to see if I can not hold my own with them. I will join with them in governing you if you are too weak to govern yourselves." I intended to be one of the class that governs, not one of the class that is governed. So I joined the political club in my district. I joined it just as I joined the National Guard. If there came a time of civic disturbance in the community, or if we were invaded or were at war with any country, I did not intend to have to hire somebody else to do my shooting for me. I intended to do it myself; and in the same way I intended to do the governing myself, to do my part of it. I want to see you feel the same way. Education is of good chiefly according to the use you put it to. If it teaches you to be so puffed with pride as to make you misestimate the relative values of things, it becomes a harm and not a benefit. There are few things less desirable than the arid cultivation, the learning and refinement which lead merely to that intellectual conceit which makes a man in a democratic community like ours hold himself aloof from his fellows and pride himself upon the weakness which he mistakes for supercilious strength. Small is the use of those educated men who in after life meet no one but themselves, and gather in parlors to discuss wrong conditions which they do not understand and to advocate remedies which have the prime defect of being unworkable. I remember ex-Speaker Reed speaking to me of how easy it was to get an absolutely perfect theory to meet any condition as long as you kept that the-

ory in the study, and how difficult it was to get even moderately good results out of any theory when you tried to apply it to hard facts of actual life. The judgment on practical affairs, political and social, of the men who keep aloof from conditions of practical life, is apt to be valueless to those other men who do wage effective war against the forces of baseness and of evil. From the political standpoint an education that leads you into the ranks of the educated ineffectives is a harm, not a good. It is a harm to all of you here if it serves you as an excuse for refusing to mingle with your fellows, for standing aloof from the broad sweep of our national life in a curiously impotent spirit of fancied superiority. If you go into politics, if you go into a ward caucus and try to carry it you lose the feeling of superiority very quickly. The political wrong-headedness of such men is quite as great as that of wholly uneducated men; and no people could be less trustworthy as critics and advisers. The educated man who seeks to console himself for his own lack of the robust qualities necessary to bring success in American politics by moaning over the degeneracy of the times instead of trying to better them, by railing at the men who do the actual work of political life instead of trying himself to do the work, is a poor creature, and, so far as his feeble powers avail, is a damage and not a help to the country. You may come far short of this disagreeable standard and still be a rather useless member of society. Your education, your cultiva-

tion, will not help you if you make the mistake of thinking that it is a substitute for instead of an addition to those qualities which in the struggle of life bring success to the ordinary man without your advantages. Your college training confers no privilege upon you save as tested by the use you make of it. It puts upon you the obligation to show yourselves better able to do certain things than your fellows who have not had your advantages. If it has served merely to make you believe that you are to be excused from effort in after life, that you are to be excused from contact with the actual world of men and events, then it will prove a curse and not a blessing. If on the other hand you treat your education as a weapon the more in your hands, a weapon to fit you to do better in the hard struggle of effort, and not as excusing you in any way from taking part in practical fashion in that struggle, then it will be a benefit to you.

Let each of you college men remember in after life that in the fundamentals he is very much like his fellows who have not been to college, and that if he is to achieve results, instead of confining himself exclusively to disparagement of other men who have achieved them, he must manage to come to some kind of working agreement with these fellows of his. There are times, of course, when it may be the highest duty of a citizen to stand alone, or practically alone. But if this is a man's normal attitude—if normally he is unable to work in combination with a considerable body of his fellows—

it is safe to set him down as unfit for useful service in a democracy. In popular government results worth having can only be achieved by men who combine worthy ideals with practical good sense; who are resolute to accomplish good purposes, but who can accommodate themselves to the give and take necessary where work has to be done, as almost all important work has to be done, by combination. Moreover, remember that normally the prime object of political life should be to achieve results and not merely to issue manifestoes—save, of course, where the issuance of such manifestoes helps to achieve the results. It is a very bad thing to be morally callous, for moral callousness is disease. But inflammation of the conscience may be just as unhealthy so far as the public is concerned; and if a man's conscience is always telling him to do something foolish he will do well to mistrust its workings. The religious man who is most useful is not he whose sole care is to save his own soul, but the man whose religion bids him strive to advance decency and clean living and to make the world a better place for his fellows to live in; and all this is just as true of the ordinary citizen in the performance of the ordinary duties of political life.

During the last few years much good has been done to the people of the Philippines; but this has been done, not by those who merely indulged in the personal luxury of advocating for the islands a doctrinaire liberty which would have meant their

immediate and irretrievable ruin, but by those who have faced facts as they actually were, remembering the proverb that teaches us that in the long run even the most uncomfortable truth is a safer companion than the pleasantest falsehood. It is these men, the men who with shortcomings and stumblings yet did the duty of the moment, though that duty was hard and often disagreeable, and not the men who confined themselves to idle talk of no matter how high-sounding a nature, who have done real good to the islands. These are the men who have brought justice as between man and man; who are building roads; who have introduced schools; who, gradually, with patience and firmness, are really fitting the islanders for self-government.

So it is with the great questions which group themselves round the control of corporations in the interest of the public. There has been a curious revival of the doctrine of State rights in connection with these questions, by the people who know that the States can not with justice to both sides practically control the corporations, and who therefore advocate such control because they do not venture to express their real wish, which is that there shall be no control at all. Honest and fair dealing railway corporations will gain and not lose by adequate Federal control; most emphatically, it is both the duty and the interest of our people to deal fairly with such corporations, and to see that a premium is put upon the honest management of them, and that

those who invest in them are amply protected. But those who invoke the doctrine of State rights to protect State corporate creations in predatory activities extended through other States are as shortsighted as those who once invoked the same doctrine to protect the special slaveholding interest. The States have shown that they have not the ability to curb the power of syndicated wealth, and, therefore, in the interest of the people, it must be done by National action. Our present warfare is against special privilege. The men—many of them, I am sorry to say, college men—who are prompt to speak against every practical means which can be devised for achieving the object we have in view—the proper and adequate supervision by the Federal Government of the great corporations doing an interstate business—are, nevertheless, themselves powerless to so much as outline any plan of constructive statesmanship which shall give relief. I have watched for six years these men, both those in public and those in private life, and though they are prompt to criticise every affirmative step taken, I have yet to see one of them lift a finger to remedy the wrongs that exist. So it is in every field of public activity. States' rights should be preserved when they mean the people's rights, but not when they mean the people's wrongs; not, for instance, when they are invoked to prevent the abolition of child labor, or to break the force of the laws which prohibit the importation of contract labor to this country; in short, not when they stand for wrong

or oppression of any kind or for national weakness or impotence at home or abroad. It is to the men who work in practical fashion with their fellows, and not to those who, whether because they are impractical or incapable, can not thus work, that we owe what success we have had in dealing with every problem which we have either solved or started on the path of solution during the last decade.

The last ten years have been years of great achievement for this Nation. During that period we have dealt and are dealing with many different matters of great moment. We have acquired the right to build, and are now building, the Panama Canal. There are going to be all kinds of difficulties in building that canal. It is a big job. Man after man will leave or will have to leave. Methods will be tried which will not prove as successful as we hope. Other methods will have to be tried. Implement after implement will prove to have a flaw in it, and finally will break where the flaw is, and we will put it aside and take another. If a man leaves, we shall put another in his place; if a method fails, we shall try another method. We have made extraordinary progress in the year and a half just past, and we will do the work in reasonable time and in first-rate shape. We have given wise government to the Philippines. We have dealt with exceedingly complex, difficult, and important questions in Cuba and Santo Domingo. In Cuba I am doing my best to persuade the Cubans

that if only they will be good they will be happy; I am seeking the very minimum of interference necessary to make them good. In Santo Domingo I am trying to forestall the necessity for interference by us or by any foreign power. I was immensely amused when, at a professional peace meeting the other day, they incidentally alluded to me as having made "war" on Santo Domingo. The war I have made literally consists in having loaned them a collector of customs, at their request. We now give them forty-five per cent of the customs to run the Government, and the other fifty-five per cent is put up to pay those of their debts which are found to be righteous. This arrangement has gone on two years now, while the co-ordinate branch of the Government discussed whether or not I had usurped power in the matter, and finally concluded I had not, and ratified the treaty. Of the fifty-five per cent we have been able to put two and a half millions toward paying their debts; and with the forty-five per cent that we collected for them they have received more money than they ever got when they collected one hundred per cent themselves; and the island has prospered as never before. I feel like paraphrasing Patrick Henry: If that is "war," make the most of it. We have built up the Navy; our surest safeguard of peace and of national honor. We are making great progress in dealing with the questions of irrigation and forestry, of preserving to the public the rightful use of the public lands and of the mineral wealth

underlying them; and with that group of vital questions which concern the proper supervision of the immense corporations doing an interstate business, the proper control of the great highways of interstate commerce, the proper regulation of industries which, if left unregulated, threaten disaster to the body politic. We have done many other things, such as securing the settlement of the Alaska boundary. We have made progress in securing better relations between capital and labor, justice as between them and as regards the general public; and adequate protection for wage-workers. We have done much in enforcing the law alike against great and small; against crimes of greed and cunning no less than against crimes of violence and brutality. We have wrought mightily for the peace of righteousness, both among the nations and in social and industrial life here at home. Much has been done, and we are girding up our loins to do more.

In all these matters there have been some men in public life and some men in private life whose action has been at every point one of barren criticism or fruitless obstruction. These men have had no part or lot in the great record of achievement and success; the record of good work worthily done. Some of these men have been college graduates; but all of them have been poor servants of the people, useless where they were not harmful. All the credit for the good thus accomplished in the public life of this decade belongs to those

who have done affirmative work in such matters as those I have enumerated above, and not to those who, with more or less futility, have sought to hamper and obstruct the work that has thus been done.

In short, you college men, be doers rather than critics of the deeds that others do. Stand stoutly for your ideals; but keep in mind that they can only be realized, even partially, by practical methods of achievement. Remember always that this Republic of ours is a very real democracy, and that you can only win success by showing that you have the right stuff in you. The college man, the man of intellect and training, should take the lead in every fight for civic and social righteousness. He can take that lead only if in a spirit of thoroughgoing democracy he takes his place among his fellows, not standing aloof from them, but mixing with them, so that he may know, may feel, may sympathize with their hopes, their ambitions, their principles—and even their prejudices—as an American among Americans, as a man among men.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
March 14, 1907

MY DEAR SIR:

Numerous commercial organizations of the Mississippi Valley have presented petitions asking that I appoint a commission to prepare and report a comprehensive plan for the improvement and control of the river systems of the United States. I

have decided to comply with these requests by appointing an Inland Waterways Commission, and I have asked the following gentlemen to act upon it. I shall be much gratified if you will consent to serve:

Hon. Theo. E. Burton (Chairman), Senator Francis G. Newlands, Senator William Warner, Hon. John H. Bankhead, General Alexander Mackenzie, Dr. W. J. McGee, Mr. F. H. Newell, Mr. Gifford Pinchot, Hon. Herbert Knox Smith.

In creating this Commission I am influenced by broad considerations of national policy. The control of our navigable waterways lies with the Federal Government, and carries with it corresponding responsibilities and obligations. The energy of our people has hitherto been largely directed toward industrial development connected with field and forest and with coal and iron, and some of these sources of material and power are already largely depleted; while our inland waterways as a whole have thus far received scant attention. It is becoming clear that our streams should be considered and conserved as great natural resources. Works designed to control our waterways have thus far usually been undertaken for a single purpose, such as the improvement of navigation, the development of power, the irrigation of arid lands, the protection of lowlands from floods, or to supply water for domestic and manufacturing purposes. While the rights of the people to these and similar uses of water must be respected, the time has come for merging local

projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the entire country. Such a plan should consider and include all the uses to which streams may be put, and should bring together and co-ordinate the points of view of all users of water. The task involved in the full and orderly development and control of the river system of the United States is a great one, yet it is certainly not too great for us to approach. The results which it seems to promise are even greater.

It is common knowledge that the railroads of the United States are no longer able to move crops and manufactures rapidly enough to secure the prompt transaction of the business of the Nation, and there is small prospect of immediate relief. Representative railroad men point out that the products of the northern interior States have doubled in ten years, while the railroad facilities have increased but one-eighth, and there is reason to doubt whether any development of the railroads possible in the near future will suffice to keep transportation abreast of production. There appears to be but one complete remedy—the development of a complementary system of transportation by water. The present congestion affects chiefly the people of the Mississippi Valley, and they demand relief. When the congestion of which they complain is relieved, the whole Nation will share the good results.

While rivers are natural resources of the first rank, they are also liable to become destructive

agencies, endangering life and property; and some of our most notable engineering enterprises have grown out of effort to control them. It was computed by Generals Humphreys and Abbott half a century ago that the Mississippi alone sweeps into its lower reaches and the Gulf 400,000,000 tons of floating sediment each year (about twice the amount of material to be excavated in opening the Panama Canal), besides an enormous but unmeasured amount of earth-salts and soil-matter carried in solution. This vast load not only causes its channels to clog and flood the lowlands of the lower river, but renders the flow capricious and difficult to control. Furthermore, the greater part of the sediment and soil-matter is composed of the most fertile material of the fields and pastures drained by the smaller and larger tributaries. Any plan for utilizing our inland waterways should consider floods and their control by forests and other means; the protection of bottomlands from injury by overflows, and uplands from loss by soil-wash; the physics of sediment-charged waters and the physical or other ways of purifying them; the construction of dams and locks, not only to facilitate navigation, but to control the character and movement of the waters; and should look to the full use and control of our running waters and the complete artificialization of our waterways for the benefit of our people as a whole.

It is not possible properly to frame so large a plan as this for the control of our rivers without

taking account of the orderly development of other natural resources. Therefore, I ask that the Inland Waterways Commission shall consider the relations of the streams to the use of all the great permanent natural resources and their conservation for the making and maintenance of prosperous homes.

Any plan for utilizing our inland waterways, to be feasible, should recognize the means for executing it already in existence, both in the Federal Departments of War, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce and Labor, and in the States and their subdivisions; and it must not involve unduly burdensome expenditures from the national treasury. The cost will necessarily be large in proportion to the magnitude of the benefits to be conferred, but it will be small in comparison with the $17,000,000,000 of capital now invested in steam railways in the United States—an amount that would have seemed enormous and incredible half a century ago. Yet the investment has been a constant source of profit to the people, and without it our industrial progress would have been impossible.

The questions which will come before the Inland Waterways Commission must necessarily relate to every part of the United States and affect every interest within its borders. Its plans should be considered in the light of the widest knowledge of the country and its people, and from the most diverse points of view. Accordingly, when its work is sufficiently advanced, I shall add to the Commission

certain consulting members, with whom I shall ask that its recommendations shall be fully discussed before they are submitted to me. The reports of the Commission should include both a general statement of the problem and recommendations as to the manner and means of attacking it.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
April 3, 1907

MY DEAR DR. SHAW:

You know how sincerely I believe that your magazine generally stands for moral betterment all around. I was really shocked to see in it the last paragraph but one in the article in the April magazine on "The Doctor in the Public School." The ordinary individual thinks so little on these questions that it is pardonable for him to think in confused fashion even on such an elementary proposition as this. But the man who affects to instruct others in matters of moral and hygienic reform must be expected to exhibit at least the rudimentary intelligence and morality necessary to prevent his saying what has been said here. The writer states clearly that it is an erroneous idea to assume that the average American family should have a larger number of healthy children than the present birth-rate shows. The vital statistics of a State like Massachusetts show that there the average native American family of native American descent has

so few children that the birth-rate has fallen below the death-rate. This, of course, means race suicide, and it ought to be understood that if after a while there are no children to go to school the question of their health in school would not even be academic.

The writer's statement that "physical defects go hand in hand with a large number of children, both in the rich and the poor," is simply not true, as he could tell at a glance by looking up, for instance, the fact that athletes are most apt to be found in fair-sized families. I am not speaking now of families of inordinate size, though even as to such the high standard of health and strength among the French Canadians, for instance, is astonishing, but of those of half a dozen children or thereabout. Let him look up any serious statistics, or study any author worth reading on the subject at all, including Benjamin Franklin, and he will see that in the ordinary family of but one or two children there is apt to be lower vitality than in a family of four or five or more. All he has to do, if he doubts this, is to study the effects of the marriages with heiresses by the British nobility. The question at issue is not between having "a few perfect children" and "a dozen unkempt degenerates"; it is between having, in the average family, a number of children so small that the race diminishes, while, curiously enough, the physique in such case likewise tends to fall off, and the reasonable growth which comes when the average family is large enough to make up for the

men and women who do not marry and for those who do and have no children, or but one or two. The writer quotes the statistics for Berlin. Let him study them a little more; let him study other statistics as well; let him turn to any book dealing with the subject if written by a man capable of touching on it at all (as, for instance, let him turn to page 162 of Finot's "Race Prejudice," which I happen at this moment to be reading), and he will see that in cities like Berlin the upper classes, the wealthier classes, tend to die out precisely because of the low birth-rate to which he points. The greatest problem of civilization is to be found in the fact that the well-to-do families tend to die out; there results, in consequence, a tendency to the elimination instead of the survival of the fittest; and the moral attitude which helps on this tendency is of course strengthened when it is apologized for and praised in a magazine like yours. It is not the very poor, it is not ignorant people with large families, who tend to read such articles in magazines like the "Review of Reviews"; it is the upper-class people who already tend to have too few children who are reached and corrupted by such teachings.

Our people could still exist under all kinds of iniquities in government; under a debased currency, under official corruption, under the rule of a socialistic proletariat, or a wealthy oligarchy. All these things would be bad for us, but the country would still exist. But it could not continue to exist if it

paid heed to the expressed or implied teachings of such articles as this. These teachings furnish excuses for every unnatural prevention of child-bearing, for every form of gross and shallow selfishness of the kind that is really the deepest reflection on, the deepest discredit to, American social life. There are countries which, and people in all countries who, need to be warned against a rabbit-like indifference to consequences in raising families. The ordinary American, whether of the old native stock or the self-respecting son or daughter of immigrants, needs no such warning. He or she needs to have impressed upon his or her mind the vital lesson that all schemes about having "doctors in public schools," about kindergartens, civic associations, women's clubs, and training families up in this way or that are preposterous nonsense if there are to be no families to train; and that it is a simple mathematical proposition that, where the average family that has children at all has only three, the race at once diminishes in numbers, and if the tendency is not checked will vanish completely—in other words, there will be race suicide. Not only the healthiest, but the highest relations in life are those of the man and the woman united on a basis of full and mutually respecting partnership and wise companionship in loving and permanent wedlock. If, through no fault of theirs, they have no children they are entitled to our deepest sympathy. If they refuse to have children sufficient in number to mean that the race goes forward and

not back,* if they refuse to bring them up healthy in body and mind, then they are criminals.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

DR. ALBERT SHAW, Editor, "Review of Reviews," New York.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
April 5, 1907

MY DEAR MR. CARNEGIE:

I much regret my inability to be present with you. Mr. Root will speak to you at length, and no man in the country is better fitted than he to address you on the subject you have so much at heart; for no man has in keener or more practical fashion, or with a nobler disinterestedness of purpose, used the national power to further what I believe to be the national purpose of bringing nearer the day when the peace of righteousness, the peace of justice, shall obtain among nations.

In this letter of mine I can do little more than wish you and your association Godspeed in your efforts. My sympathy with the purposes you have

* This must mean, on an average, four among the families which are not, from natural causes, childless or limited to a less number than four. Prof. Edward A. Ross, of the University of Wisconsin, has put the matter concisely as follows: "The type to be standardized is not the family from one to three, but the family of four to six. The one-child or two-child ideal growing in favor with the middle class would, if popularized, hurry us to extinction."

at heart is both strong and real, and by right of it I shall make to you some suggestions as to the practical method for accomplishing the ends we all of us have in view. First and foremost, I beseech you to remember that though it is our bounden duty to work for peace, yet it is even more our duty to work for righteousness and justice. It is "righteousness that exalteth a nation," and normally peace is the handmaid of righteousness, yet, if they are ever at odds, it is righteousness whose cause we must espouse. In the second place, I again earnestly ask that all good and earnest men who believe strongly in this cause, but who have not themselves to bear the responsibility of upholding the Nation's honor, shall not by insisting upon the impossible put off the day when the possible can be accomplished. The peoples of the world have advanced unequally along the road that leads to justice and fair dealing, one with another (exactly as there has been unequal progress in securing such justice by each within its own borders); and the road stretches far ahead even of the most advanced. Harm and not good would result if the most advanced nations, those in which most freedom for the individual is combined with most efficiency in securing orderly justice as between individuals, should by agreement disarm and place themselves at the mercy of other peoples less advanced, of other peoples still in the stage of military barbarism or military despotism. Anything in the nature of general disarmament would do harm and

not good if it left the civilized and peace-loving peoples, those with the highest standards of municipal and international obligation and duty, unable to check the other peoples who have no such standards, who acknowledge no such obligations.

Finally, it behooves all of us to remember, and especially those of us who either make or listen to speeches, that there are few more mischievous things than the custom of uttering or applauding sentiments which represent mere oratory, and which are not, and can not be, and have not been, translated from words into deeds. An impassioned oration about peace which includes an impassioned demand for something which the man who makes the demand either knows or ought to know can not, as a matter of fact, be done, represents not gain, but loss, for the cause of peace; for even the noblest cause is marred by advocacy which is either insincere or foolish.

These warnings that I have uttered do not mean that I believe we can do nothing to advance the cause of international peace. On the contrary, I believe that we can do much to advance it, provided only we act with sanity, with self-restraint, with power; which must be the prime qualities in the achievement of any reform. The nineteenth century saw, on the whole, a real and great advance in the standard of international conduct, both as among civilized nations and by strong nations toward weaker and more backward peoples. The twentieth century will, I believe, witness a much

greater advance in the same direction. The United States has a right to speak on behalf of such a cause, and to ask that its course during the half dozen opening years of the century be accepted as a guaranty of the truth of its professions. During these six years we can conscientiously say that without sacrificing our own rights we have yet scrupulously respected the rights of all other peoples. With the great military nations of the world, alike in Europe and in that newest Asia which is also the oldest, we have preserved a mutually self-respecting and kindly friendship. In the Philippine Islands we are training a people in the difficult art of self-government with more success than those best acquainted with the facts had dared to hope. We are doing this because we have acted in a spirit of genuine disinterestedness, of genuine and single-minded purpose to benefit the islanders —and I may add, in a spirit wholly untainted by that silly sentimentality which is often more dangerous to both the subject and the object than downright iniquity. In Panama we are successfully performing what is to be the greatest engineering feat of the ages, and while we are assuming the whole burden of the work, we have explicitly pledged ourselves that the use is to be free for all mankind. In the islands of the Caribbean we have interfered not as conquerors, but solely to avert the need of conquest. The United States Army is at this moment in Cuba, not as an act of war, but to restore Cuba to the position of a self-governing

republic. With Santo Domingo we have just negotiated a treaty especially designed to prevent the need of any interference either by us or by any foreign nation with the internal affairs of the island, while at the same time securing to honest creditors their debts and to the government of the island an assured income, and giving to the islanders themselves the chance, if only they will take advantage of it, to achieve the internal peace they so sorely need. Mr. Root's trip through South America marked the knitting together in the bonds of self-respecting friendship of all the republics of this continent; it marked a step toward the creation among them of a community of public feeling which will tell for justice and peace throughout the Western Hemisphere. By the joint good offices of Mexico and ourselves we averted one war in Central America, and did what we could to avert another, although we failed. We have more than once, while avoiding officious international meddling, shown our readiness to help other nations secure peace among themselves. A difficulty which we had with our friendly neighbor to the south of us, we solved by referring it to arbitration at The Hague. A difficulty which we had with our friendly neighbor to the north of us, we solved by the agreement of a joint commission composed of representatives of the two peoples in interest. We try to avoid meddling in affairs that are not our concern, and yet to have our views heard where they will avail on behalf of fair dealing and against cruelty and op-

pression. We have concluded certain arbitration treaties. I only regret that we have not concluded a larger number.

Our representatives will go to the second peace conference at The Hague instructed to help in every practicable way to bring some steps nearer completion the great work which the first conference began. It is idle to expect that a task so tremendous can be settled by any one or two conferences, and those who demand the impossible from such a conference not only prepare acute disappointment for themselves, but by arousing exaggerated and baseless hopes which are certain to be disappointed, play the game of the very men who wish the conference to accomplish nothing. It is not possible that the conference should go more than a certain distance farther in the right direction. Yet I believe that it can make real progress on the road toward international justice, peace, and fair dealing. One of the questions, although not to my mind one of the most important, which will be brought before the conference, will be that of the limitation of armaments. The United States, owing to its peculiar position, has a regular army so small as to be infinitesimal when compared to that of any other first-class power. But the circumstances which enable this to be so are peculiar to our case, and do not warrant us in assuming the offensive attitude of schoolmaster toward other nations. We are no longer enlarging our Navy. We are simply keeping up its strength, very moderate indeed when

compared with our wealth, population, and coast-line; for the addition of one battleship a year barely enables us to make good the units which become obsolete. The most practicable step in diminishing the burden of expense caused by the increasing size of naval armaments would, I believe, be an agreement limiting the size of all ships hereafter to be built; but hitherto it has not proved possible to get other nations to agree with us on this point.

More important than reducing the expense of the implements of war is the question of reducing the possible causes of war, which can most effectually be done by substituting other methods than war for the settlement of disputes. Of these other methods the most important which is now attainable is arbitration. I do not believe that in the world as it actually is it is possible for any nation to agree to arbitrate all difficulties which may arise between itself and other nations; but I do believe that there can be at this time a very large increase in the classes of cases which it is agreed shall be arbitrated, and that provision can be made for greater facility and certainty of arbitration. I hope to see adopted a general arbitration treaty among the nations; and I hope to see The Hague Court greatly increased in power and permanency, and the judges in particular made permanent and given adequate salaries, so as to make it increasingly probable that in each case that may come before them they will decide between the nations, great or small, exactly as a judge within our own limits

decides between the individuals, great or small, who come before him. Doubtless many other matters will be taken up at The Hague; but it seems to me that this of a general arbitration treaty is perhaps the most important.

Again wishing you all good fortune in your work,

Sincerely yours.

MR. ANDREW CARNEGIE

President, the National Arbitration and Peace Congress, New York, N. Y.

AT THE UNVEILING OF THE MONUMENT IN MEMORY OF THE DEAD OF THE FIRST U. S. VOLUNTEER CAVALRY AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, APRIL 12, 1907

Fellow-Citizens; and you, Members of my Regiment, in especial:

It must necessarily be to all of us who served in the First United States Volunteer Cavalry a matter of peculiar gratification to see this memorial erected to the memory of our dead. I am sure that none who were there will ever forget the funeral services that you held, Chaplain Brown, over those who were killed in the Guasimas fight —the first fight that we saw, the fight in which we served under the after-time Lieutenant-General of the United States Army who is here with us to-day, General Young. General Young, there is not a member of the Regiment who will not always hold you in peculiar regard. Before we came down here you told us that if we would get into your

brigade you would see that we got into the first fight, and you kept your word. Any war must bring bitter grief to some people, and the deepest woe, the grief hardest to bear, must come not to those who go to the war, but to the women and children who stay behind. I have no regard for the man who dreads overmuch to meet the inevitable death in so worthy a fashion as when he meets it in battle for his country. I never have felt that there was as much need of pity for, as for respect and admiration for, those to whom the supreme good fortune comes of dying well on the field of battle whither their duty has called them. We mourn them, but our mourning is the mourning of pride and of admiration even more than of grief. Their lot is not hard. But the lot of the women and children who stay behind is the lot which calls for our sincere sympathy, for our sincere pity. Almost every man who dies leaves a vacancy in some home that can never be but more than partially filled. The greatest sacrifices in war are made not by those who go to the front, who know the eager excitement of battle, and who, if they are worthy to be called men at all, feel the most buoyant exaltation in the good fortune which has given them the chance to show their manhood on stricken fields; our sympathy is not for them, but for those whose harder task it is to wait at home, uncheered by the stern joy of battle, and who have to meet with as brave a front as may be the news, good or ill, that comes from the front.

I speak here in the presence of the regulars of the United States Army and Navy. All of us who served in the volunteer forces during the Spanish War came out of the war having learned, so far as we needed to learn, the lesson of the heartiest admiration for the officers and enlisted men of the regular Army and Navy of the United States. It was our business to serve in the Army for a short while. It is yours to serve as your life work. You do for the country what no other body of its fellow-citizens can do, and I am sure that all volunteers came out of the war feeling, as I certainly did, that it should be our aim thereafter in private life or in public life to do everything that lay in our power for the Army and Navy of the Union, for the Army and the Navy which, by their readiness for war, make the greatest guaranty for peace that this country possesses. There was one peculiar reason for pleasure in the Spanish-American War, one reason above all others why our people should look back to it with pride and satisfaction, and that is the fact that it marked in very truth the complete reunion of our country. In that war there served in the ranks and in the positions of junior officers the sons of men who had worn the blue and the sons of men who had worn the gray; and they served under men who in their youth had begun their careers as soldiers, some of them in the army of Grant, some of them in the army of Lee. Side by side with Young and Chaffee and Lawton served Wheeler and Fitzhugh Lee. In our own regiment there were

at least as many sons of the ex-Confederates as sons of ex-Union soldiers, and they stood shoulder to shoulder, knit together by the closest of ties, and acknowledging with respect to one another only that generous jealousy each to try to be first to do all that in him lay for the honor and the interest of the flag that covered the reunited country.

There is another lesson taught by every war well waged, taught pre-eminently by the Civil War, but taught also by any lesser war such as that in which we were engaged. That is the lesson of real democracy which consists in treating each man in good faith on his worth as a man. It is a mighty good thing for all of us to be thrown into intimate contact with one another under circumstances which test the real worth of each of us, and there is nothing that will give a man a clearer idea of the value of his fellow than to lie in the same trench with him, to march beside him, to be in camp with him, and to be under fire through a day's good stiff fighting with him. That will try out a man; you will find out what he is worth then; by the end of that day you won't care a snap of your finger whether he has been a banker or a bricklayer. whether he is a rich man or a poor man, what his occupation is, where he was born, or how he worships his Maker. What you will care to learn is if he has the right stuff in him. When you started in the morning on a march and divided up the three days' rations with your bunky you wanted to be dead sure that the bunky did not throw away

his half and then come in in the evening and want to share yours. What is more, you did not want any man around who was always waiting for the heroic times and who did not care to begin to do his duty until they arrived; the man you cared for was the man who did his ordinary plain duty right along just as it came, from digging sinks and policing camp to leading a forlorn hope.

All of this contains just the lesson that we need most in our civil life. We could not get on in the army, we never could conduct a war to a successful conclusion, if we permitted ourselves to be sundered by any class or caste or social or sectional or religious prejudice; and we can not conduct the affairs of this Nation as they can and shall be conducted save by putting into effect the same traits that enable us to do well in war. Distrust above all other men the man who seeks to make you pass judgment upon your fellow-citizens upon any ground of artificial distinction between you and them. Distrust the man who seeks to get you to favor them or discriminate against them either because they are well off or not well off, because they occupy one social position or another, because they live in one part of the country or another, or because they profess one creed or another. Remember this: Arrogance and envy are not different qualities; they are merely different manifestations of the same qualities. The rich man who looks down upon or oppresses the poor man is the very man who, if poor, would envy and hate

the man who was richer. Conversely the poor man who regards with bitter and malignant envy the man who is better off, who preaches the doctrine of hate toward that man, is himself the man who, if it had happened that he were rich, would grind down the faces of those who were less well off than he.

You can pretty well tell in the ranks whether the man is the type of man you would be willing to work alongside of or under, or to have work under you. If he has the quality that makes him a good man in one relation, he is apt to have the quality that would make him a good man in the other relations. In other words, friends, we can not afford in our civic life to permit the existence of any standard save the standard of conduct as being the standard by which we judge our fellow-citizen. We can not afford to judge him by the accident of his position. We must judge him by the fundamentals of his character, by what there is in him, not by where it happens that he is placed.

Let us remember, all of us, that while now and then a good deal can be done by legislation, yet fundamentally, in the last resort, what counts is less the outward law than the soul of the man who stands behind the law. In war, you can do nothing without proper discipline and training; yet there are some men whom you might train and discipline until eternity and they would not be worth anything then; whom you can not get anything out of because it is not in them to get out. So it

is in civil affairs. If the average citizen hasn't got the right qualities in him, then the best constitution, the best laws, the best administration of the laws that the wit of man can devise, will avail nothing to save the nation. If the average man, the average woman, is not of the right type, the nation will go down; and I think on the whole our Nation will continue to go up, because I think that the average American is a pretty good fellow—and I may add that I think his wife an even better fellow. Of course, it is necessary above all for us to remember to do the seemingly little humdrum daily duties well. The first step to take toward good citizenship by any man is to be a good man in his own home. If he is a good husband, a good father, a good son, if he works hard for those who are dependent upon him, and if he is tender and considerate of them, then he has taken the first step toward good citizenship, and if he hasn't taken the step, I don't care how lofty his professions are outside, he is a poor citizen. The man who does not take care of his family, who is shiftless, who does not work, who is unkind, cruel, thoughtless toward his wife or his children, who is a bad son, a bad husband, a bad father, is not and can not possibly be a good citizen. But he is just the type of man who is apt to gather with a number of others of the same kind and demand that the whole social and economic constitution of the country ought to be changed! He is very strong on that point, but he does not begin where he ought to and change what

is most important—that is, himself. Wage stern war on all public abuses of country; strive mightily for reforms; but begin by being a good man in your own home.

But, of course, that is not enough. Go on, and be a good man in your relations with your neighbors. You can not be of real use to the state if you are the type of man whom nobody wants to have live next door to him, or do business with. If you are the kind of man that the neighbor is glad to have move into the house next to him, and glad to do business with down at the corner store, you are a pretty good citizen. And even this is not enough. You have got to be a good American, a good citizen of our common country. Do the humdrum duties. Remember that you can never amount to anything if the heroic days should arise unless you have done your ordinary workaday duties first. Yet remember also, that if the need arises, you must also have in you the divine spark (the life of soul) which will make you spring eagerly forward to do the deeds of a hero when the times call for the deeds of a hero. In the times that tried men's souls, from 1861 to 1865, it was necessary not merely that the man should have good aspirations, that he should be a kindly, decent man, but that he should have iron in his blood, that he should have in him the quality that enabled him to meet the great and terrible crisis that had arisen. So it is in our whole civic life. It is not enough that we should possess those kindly and generous

and thoughtful qualities, the unselfish qualities which are indispensable. We must have them as the foundation; and, in addition, we must have the qualities which in their sum we designate as manliness; else we can not do our duties of citizenship aright. The man who is simply kind and well-meaning, but who has not the fibre in him which makes him flame with righteous indignation against wrong, which makes him feel a healthy desire to put down wrong-doing and punish the wrong-doers, is not going to make much of a citizen. In war, in addition to devotion to the flag, in addition to love of country, each man who is worth his salt must have the fighting edge. Unless he has it he isn't of use in an army. So it is in civic life. We must have honesty first, but honesty is not enough. In addition to honesty, and ranging equal with it, we must have courage, efficiency, the power that makes decency and honesty and right living an effective force in the world. And after you have both honesty and courage, they are not enough. We need honesty and courage, and joined with them we need the saving grace of common-sense. When we have the three qualities combined, we have a man who will make a good soldier if the occasion arises, and who will make a good citizen in the ordinary affairs of life.

On an occasion like this, when we gather to honor the memory of the valiant dead, let us remember that we can best honor their memory by trying to learn from their death something that will make our lives more useful to our country. Naturally,

you here who are not of our regiment can not feel as we feel toward those dead men whom this monument commemorates. By a strange fatality, among the earliest killed were some of the very best—I am inclined to say the very best—of our number. I think the two most valuable officers we had were Captains Capron and O'Neill, who were killed, one at Las Guasimas and one at San Juan. It seemed to me as if every man who was slain possessed some qualities which had made him of especial worth to the regiment. It was hard to see them lying dead in the bright Cuban sunlight, and to feel that their young lives were cut short in the full bloom of their promise. Yet, as I said before, all those who were willing to think could not but realize that the men who had thus met their fate had merely anticipated by a few years the fate that is coming to all of us, and that to them had been given the supreme good fortune of dying honorably on a well-fought field for their country's flag. It will be a poor thing for this or any other nation when it loses the sense of sternly joyous exaltation at the thought of such a fate; when it ceases to feel respect and reverence and an admiration which, were it less worthy, I should be tempted to call wellnigh envious for those to whom such good fortune has come.

Such is the personal feeling that we who were connected with the regiment necessarily have in coming here. But the supreme lesson for all of us is the lesson I have tried to draw, that the homage that counts is the homage, not of the lips, but of

the heart; the homage we pay to the memory of the valiant dead when we firmly resolve so to lead our lives that when we die we may feel not wholly unworthy to have been their comrades.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
April 15, 1907

TO THE SCHOOL CHILDREN OF THE UNITED STATES:

Arbor Day (which means simply "Tree Day") is now observed in every State in our Union—and mainly in the schools. At various times from January to December, but chiefly in this month of April, you give a day or part of a day to special exercises and perhaps to actual tree-planting, in recognition of the importance of trees to us as a nation, and of what they yield in adornment, comfort, and useful products to the communities in which you live.

It is well that you should celebrate your Arbor Day thoughtfully, for within your lifetime the Nation's need of trees will become serious. We of an older generation can get along with what we have, though with growing hardship; but in your full manhood and womanhood you will want what nature once so bountifully supplied and man so thoughtlessly destroyed; and because of that want you will reproach us, not for what we have used, but for what we have wasted.

For the Nation, as for the man or woman and the boy or girl, the road to success is the right use of what we have and the improvement of present

opportunity. If you neglect to prepare yourselves now for the duties and responsibilities which will fall upon you later, if you do not learn the things which you will need to know when your school-days are over, you will suffer the consequences. So any nation which in its youth lives only for the day, reaps without sowing, and consumes without husbanding, must expect the penalty of the prodigal whose labor could with difficulty find him the bare means of life.

A people without children would face a hopeless future; a country without trees is almost as hopeless; forests which are so used that they can not renew themselves will soon vanish, and with them all their benefits. A true forest is not merely a storehouse full of wood, but, as it were, a factory of wood, and at the same time a reservoir of water. When you help to preserve our forests or to plant new ones, you are acting the part of good citizens. The value of forestry deserves, therefore, to be taught in the schools, which aim to make good citizens of you. If your Arbor Day exercises help you to realize what benefits each one of you receives from the forests, and how by your assistance these benefits may continue, they will serve a good end.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
April 22, 1907

DEAR SIR:

I have received your letter of the 19th instant, in which you enclose the draft of the formal letter

which is to follow. I have been notified that several delegations, bearing similar requests, are on the way hither. In the letter you, on behalf of the Cook County Moyer-Haywood conference, protest against certain language I used in a recent letter which you assert to be designed to influence the course of justice in the case of the trial for murder of Messrs. Moyer and Haywood. I entirely agree with you that it is improper to endeavor to influence the course of justice, whether by threats or in any similar manner. For this reason I have regretted most deeply the action of such organizations as your own in undertaking to accomplish this very result in the very case of which you speak. For instance, your letter is headed "Cook County Moyer-Haywood-Pettibone Conference," with the headlines: "*Death* —can not—will not—and shall not claim our brothers!" This shows that you and your associates are not demanding a fair trial, or working for a fair trial, but are announcing in advance that the verdict shall only be one way and that you will not tolerate any other verdict. Such action is flagrant in its impropriety, and I join heartily in condemning it.

But it is a simple absurdity to suppose that because any man is on trial for a given offence he is therefore to be freed from all criticism upon his general conduct and manner of life. In my letter to which you object, I referred to a certain prominent financier, Mr. Harriman, on the one hand, and to Messrs. Moyer, Haywood, and Debs on the other,

as being equally undesirable citizens. It is as foolish to assert that this was designed to influence the trial of Moyer and Haywood as to assert that it was designed to influence the suits that have been brought against Mr. Harriman. I neither expressed nor indicated any opinion as to whether Messrs. Moyer and Haywood were guilty of the murder of Governor Steunenberg. If they are guilty they certainly ought to be punished. If they are not guilty they certainly ought not to be punished. But no possible outcome either of the trial or the suits can affect my judgment as to the undesirability of the type of citizenship of those whom I mentioned. Messrs. Moyer, Haywood, and Debs stand as representatives of those men who have done as much to discredit the labor movement as the worst speculative financiers or most unscrupulous employers of labor and debauchers of legislatures have done to discredit honest capitalists and fair-dealing business men. They stand as the representatives of those men who by their public utterances and manifestoes, by the utterances of the papers they control or inspire, and by the words and deeds of those associated with or subordinated to them, habitually appear as guilty of incitement to or apology for bloodshed and violence. If this does not constitute undesirable citizenship, then there can never be any undesirable citizens. The men whom I denounce represent the men who have abandoned that legitimate movement for the uplifting of labor, with which I have the most hearty

sympathy; they have adopted practices which cut them off from those who lead this legitimate movement. In every way I shall support the law-abiding and upright representatives of labor; and in no way can I better support them than by drawing the sharpest possible line between them on the one hand, and, on the other hand, those preachers of violence who are themselves the worst foes of the honest laboring man.

Let me repeat my deep regret that any body of men should so far forget their duty to the country as to endeavor by the formation of societies and in other ways to influence the course of justice in this matter. I have received many such letters as yours. Accompanying them were newspaper clippings announcing demonstrations, parades, and mass-meetings designed to show that the representatives of labor, without regard to the facts, demand the acquittal of Messrs. Haywood and Moyer. Such meetings can, of course, be designed only to coerce court or jury in rendering a verdict, and they therefore deserve all the condemnation which you in your letters say should be awarded to those who endeavor improperly to influence the course of justice.

You would, of course, be entirely within your rights if you merely announced that you thought Messrs. Moyer and Haywood were "desirable citizens"—though in such case I should take frank issue with you and should say that, wholly without regard to whether or not they were guilty of the crime for which they are now being tried, they rep-

resent as thoroughly undesirable a type of citizenship as can be found in this country; a type which, in the letter to which you so unreasonably take exception, I showed not to be confined to any one class, but to exist among some representatives of great capitalists as well as among some representatives of wage-workers. In that letter I condemned both types. Certain representatives of the great capitalists in turn condemned me for including Mr. Harriman in my condemnation of Messrs. Moyer and Haywood. Certain of the representatives of labor in their turn condemned me because I included Messrs. Moyer and Haywood as undesirable citizens together with Mr. Harriman. I am as profoundly indifferent to the condemnation in one case as in the other. I challenge as a right the support of all good Americans, whether wage-workers or capitalists, whatever their occupation or creed, or in whatever portion of the country they live, when I condemn both the types of bad citizenship which I have held up to reprobation. It seems to me a mark of utter insincerity to fail thus to condemn both; and to apologize for either robs the man thus apologizing of all right to condemn any wrong-doing in any man, rich or poor, in public or in private life.

You say you ask for a "square deal" for Messrs. Moyer and Haywood. So do I. When I say "square deal," I mean a square deal to every one; it is equally a violation of the policy of the square deal for a capitalist to protest against denunciation of a capitalist who is guilty of wrong-doing and

for a labor leader to protest against the denunciation of a labor leader who has been guilty of wrong-doing. I stand for equal justice to both; and so far as in my power lies I shall uphold justice, whether the man accused of guilt has behind him the wealthiest corporations, the greatest aggregations of riches in the country, or whether he has behind him the most influential labor organizations in the country. Very truly yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

MR. HONORE JAXON, Chairman,
667 West Lake Street,
Chicago, Ill.

AT THE OPENING OF THE JAMESTOWN EXPOSITION, APRIL 26, 1907

At the outset I wish to say a word of special greeting to the representatives of the foreign governments here present. They have come to assist us in celebrating what was in very truth the birthday of this Nation, for it was here that the colonists first settled, whose incoming, whose growth from their own loins and by the addition of new-comers from abroad, was to make the people which one hundred and sixty-nine years later assumed the solemn responsibilities and weighty duties of complete independence.

In welcoming all of you I must say a special word, first to the representative of the people of Great Britain and Ireland. The fact that so many of our people, of whom as it happens I myself am one, have but a very small portion of English blood

in our veins, in no way alters the other fact that this Nation was founded by Englishmen, by the Cavalier and the Puritan. Their tongue, law, literature, the fund of their common thought, made an inheritance which all of us share, and marked deep the lines along which we have developed. It was the men of English stock who did most in casting the mold into which our national character was run.

Let me furthermore greet all of you, the representatives of the people of continental Europe. From almost every nation of Europe we have drawn some part of our blood, some part of our traits. This mixture of blood has gone on from the beginning, and with it has gone on a kind of development unexampled among peoples of the stocks from which we spring; and hence to-day we differ sharply from, and yet in some ways are fundamentally akin to, all of the nations of Europe.

Again, let me bid you welcome, representatives of our sister Republics of this continent. In the larger aspect, your interests and ours are identical. Your problems and ours are in large part the same; and as we strive to settle them, I pledge you herewith on the part of this Nation the heartiest friendship and good-will.

Finally, let me say a special word of greeting to those representatives of the Asiatic nations who make up that newest East which is yet the most ancient East, the East of time immemorial. In particular, let me express a word of hearty welcome to the representative of the mighty island empire

of Japan; that empire, which, in learning from the West, has shown that it had so much, so very much, to teach the West in return.

To all of you here gathered I express my thanks for your coming, and I extend to you my earnest wishes for the welfare of your several nations. The world has moved so far that it is no longer necessary to believe that one nation can rise only by thrusting another down. All farsighted statesmen, all true patriots, now earnestly wish that the leading nations of mankind, as in their several ways they struggle constantly toward a higher civilization, a higher humanity, may advance hand in hand, united only in a generous rivalry to see which can best do its allotted work in the world. I believe that there is a rising tide in human thought which tends for righteous international peace; a tide which it behooves us to guide through rational channels to sane conclusions; and all of us here present can well afford to take to heart St. Paul's counsel: "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men."

We have met to-day to celebrate the opening of the Exposition which itself commemorates the first permanent settlement of men of our stock in Virginia, the first beginning of what has since become this mighty Republic. Three hundred years ago a handful of English adventurers, who had crossed the ocean in what we should now call cockle-boats, as clumsy as they were frail, landed in the great wooded wilderness, the Indian-haunted waste, which

then stretched down to the water's edge along the entire Atlantic Coast. They were not the first men of European race to settle in what is now the United States, for there were already Spanish settlements in Florida and on the headwaters of the Rio Grande; and the French, who at almost the same time were struggling up the St. Lawrence, were likewise destined to form permanent settlements on the Great Lakes and in the valley of the mighty Mississippi before the people of English stock went westward of the Alleghenies. Moreover, both the Dutch and the Swedes were shortly to found colonies between the two sets of English colonies, those that grew up around the Potomac and those that grew up on what is now the New England coast. Nevertheless, this landing at Jamestown possesses for us of the United States an altogether peculiar significance, and this without regard to our several origins. The men who landed at Jamestown and those who, thirteen years later, landed at Plymouth, all of English stock, and their fellow-settlers who during the next few decades streamed in after them, were those who took the lead in shaping the life history of this people in the colonial and revolutionary days. It was they who bent into definite shape our Nation while it was still young enough most easily, most readily, to take on the characteristics which were to become part of its permanent life habit.

Yet let us remember that while this early English colonial stock has left deeper than all others

upon our national life the mark of its strong twin individualities, the mark of the Cavalier and of the Puritan—nevertheless, this stock, not only from its environment but also from the presence with it of other stocks, almost from the beginning began to be differentiated strongly from any European people. As I have already said, about the time the first English settlers landed here, the Frenchman and the Spaniard, the Swede and the Dutchman, also came hither as permanent dwellers, who left their seed behind them to help shape and partially to inherit our national life. The German, the Irishman, and the Scotchman came later, but still in colonial times. Before the outbreak of the Revolution the American people, not only because of their surroundings, physical and spiritual, but because of the mixture of blood that had already begun to take place, represented a new and distinct ethnic type. This type has never been fixed in blood. All through the colonial days new waves of immigration from time to time swept hither across the ocean, now from one country, now from another. The same thing has gone on ever since our birth as a nation; and for the last sixty years the tide of immigration has been at the full. The new-comers are soon absorbed into our eager national life, and are radically and profoundly changed thereby, the rapidity of their assimilation being marvelous. But each group of new-comers, as it adds its blood to the life, also changes it somewhat, and this change and growth and development have gone on stead-

ily, generation by generation, throughout three centuries.

The pioneers of our people who first landed on these shores on that eventful day three centuries ago had before them a task which during the early years was of heartbreaking danger and difficulty. The conquest of a new continent is iron work. People who dwell in old civilizations and find that therein so much of humanity's lot is hard, are apt to complain against the conditions as being solely due to man and to speak as if life could be made easy and simple if there were but a virgin continent in which to work. It is true that the pioneer life was simpler, but it was certainly not easier. As a matter of fact, the first work of the pioneers in taking possession of a lonely wilderness is so rough, so hard, so dangerous that all but the strongest spirits fail. The early iron days of such a conquest search out alike the weak in body and the weak in soul. In the warfare against the rugged sternness of primeval Nature, only those can conquer who are themselves unconquerable. It is not until the first bitter years have passed that the life becomes easy enough to invite a mass of new-comers, and so great are the risk, hardship, and toil of the early years that there always exists a threat of lapsing back from civilization.

The history of the pioneers of Jamestown, of the founders of Virginia, illustrates the truth of all this. Famine and pestilence and war menaced the little band of daring men who had planted them-

selves alone on the edge of a frowning continent. Moreover, as men ever find, whether in the tiniest frontier community or in the vastest and most highly organized and complex civilized society, their worst foes were in their own bosoms. Dissension, distrust, the inability of some to work and the unwillingness of others, jealousy, arrogance and envy, folly and laziness—in short, all the shortcomings with which we have to grapple now, were faced by those pioneers, and at moments threatened their whole enterprise with absolute ruin. It was some time before the ground on which they had landed supported them, in spite of its potential fertility, and they looked across the sea for supplies. At one moment so hopeless did they become that the whole colony embarked, and was only saved from abandoning the country by the opportune arrival of help from abroad.

At last they took root in the land, and were already prospering when the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth. In a few years a great inflow of settlers began. Four of the present States of New England were founded. Virginia waxed apace. The Carolinas grew up to the south of it, and Maryland to the north of it. The Dutch colonies between, which had already absorbed the Swedish, were in their turn absorbed by the English. Pennsylvania was founded and, later still, Georgia. There were many wars with the Indians and with the dauntless captains whose banners bore the lilies of France. At last the British flag flew without a rival in all

eastern North America. Then came the successful struggle for national independence.

For half a century after we became a separate nation there was comparatively little immigration to this country. Then the tide once again set hither, and has flowed in ever-increasing size until in each of the last three years a greater number of people came to these shores than had landed on them during the entire colonial period. Generation by generation these people have been absorbed into the national life. Generally their sons, almost always their grandsons, are indistinguishable from one another and from their fellow-Americans descended from the colonial stock. For all alike the problems of our existence are fundamentally the same, and for all alike these problems change from generation to generation.

In the colonial period, and for at least a century after its close, the conquest of the continent, the expansion of our people westward, to the Alleghenies, then to the Mississippi, then to the Pacific, was always one of the most important tasks, and sometimes the most important, in our national life. Behind the first settlers the conditions grew easier, and in the older-settled regions of all the colonies life speedily assumed much of comfort and something of luxury; and though generally it was on a much more democratic basis than life in the Old World, it was by no means democratic when judged by our modern standards; and here and there, as in the tide-water regions of Virginia, a genuine

aristocracy grew and flourished. But the men who first broke ground in the virgin wilderness, whether on the Atlantic Coast or in the interior, fought hard for mere life. In the early stages the frontiersman had to do battle with the savage, and when the savage was vanquished there remained the harder strain of war with the hostile forces of soil and climate, with flood, fever, and famine. There was sickness, and bitter weather; there were no roads; there was a complete lack of all but the very roughest and most absolute necessaries. Under such circumstances the men and women who made ready the continent for civilization were able themselves to spend but little time in doing aught but the rough work which was to make smooth the ways of their successors. In consequence observers whose insight was spoiled by lack of sympathy always found both the settlers and their lives unattractive and repellent. In "Martin Chuzzlewit" the description of America, culminating in the description of the frontier town of Eden, was true and life-like from the standpoint of one content to look merely at the outer shell; and yet it was a community like Eden that gave birth to Abraham Lincoln; it was men such as were therein described from whose loins Andrew Jackson sprang.

Hitherto each generation among us has had its allotted task, now heavier, now lighter. In the Revolutionary War the business was to achieve independence. Immediately afterward there was an even more momentous task; that to achieve the na-

tional unity and the capacity for orderly development, without which our liberty, our independence, would have been a curse and not a blessing. In each of these two contests, while there were many great leaders from many different States, it is but fair to say that the foremost place was taken by the soldiers and the statesmen of Virginia; and to Virginia was reserved the honor of producing the hero of both movements, the hero of the war, and of the peace that made good the results of the war—George Washington; while the two great political tendencies of the time can be symbolized by the names of two other great Virginians—Jefferson and Marshall—from one of whom we inherit the abiding trust in the people which is the foundation stone of democracy, and from the other the power to develop on behalf of the people a coherent and powerful government, a genuine and representative nationality.

Two generations passed before the second great crisis of our history had to be faced. Then came the Civil War, terrible and bitter in itself and in its aftermath, but a struggle from which the Nation finally emerged united in fact as well as in name, united forever. Oh, my hearers, my fellow-countrymen, great indeed has been our good fortune; for as time clears away the mists that once shrouded brother from brother and made each look "as through a glass darkly" at the other, we can all feel the same pride in the valor, the devotion, and the fealty toward the right as it was given to each to

see the right, shown alike by the men who wore the blue and by the men who wore the gray. Rich and prosperous though we are as a people, the proudest heritage that each of us has, no matter where he may dwell, North or South, East or West, is the immaterial heritage of feeling, the right to claim as his own all the valor and all the steadfast devotion to duty shown by the men of both the great armies, of the soldiers whose leader was Grant and the soldiers whose leader was Lee. The men and the women of the Civil War did their duty bravely and well in the days that were dark and terrible and splendid. We, their descendants, who pay proud homage to their memories, and glory in the feats of might of one side no less than of the other, need to keep steadily in mind that the homage which counts is the homage of heart and of hand, and not of the lips, the homage of deeds and not of words only. We, too, in our turn, must prove our truth by our endeavor. We must show ourselves worthy sons of the men of the mighty days by the way in which we meet the problems of our own time. We carry our heads high because our fathers did well in the years that tried men's souls; and we must in our turn so bear ourselves that the children who come after us may feel that we too have done our duty.

We can not afford to forget the maxim upon which Washington insisted, that the surest way to avert war is to be prepared to meet it. Nevertheless, the duties that most concern us of this genera-

tion are not military, but social and industrial. Each community must always dread the evils which spring up as attendant upon the very qualities which give it success. We of this mighty western Republic have to grapple with the dangers that spring from popular self-government tried on a scale incomparably vaster than ever before in the history of mankind, and from an abounding material prosperity greater also than anything which the world has hitherto seen.

As regards the first set of dangers, it behooves us to remember that men can never escape being governed. Either they must govern themselves or they must submit to being governed by others. If from lawlessness or fickleness, from folly or self-indulgence, they refuse to govern themselves, then most assuredly in the end they will have to be governed from the outside. They can prevent the need of government from without only by showing that they possess the power of government from within. A sovereign can not make excuses for his failures; a sovereign must accept the responsibility for the exercise of the power that inheres in him; and where, as is true in our Republic, the people are sovereign, then the people must show a sober understanding and a sane and steadfast purpose if they are to preserve that orderly liberty upon which as a foundation every republic must rest.

In industrial matters our enormous prosperity has brought with it certain grave evils. It is our duty to try to cut out these evils without at the

same time destroying our well-being itself. This is an era of combination alike in the world of capital and in the world of labor. Each kind of combination can do good, and yet each, however powerful, must be opposed when it does ill. At the moment the greatest problem before us is how to exercise such control over the business use of vast wealth, individual, but especially corporate, as will ensure its not being used against the interest of the public, while yet permitting such ample legitimate profits as will encourage individual initiative. It is our business to put a stop to abuses and to prevent their recurrence, without showing a spirit of mere vindictiveness for what has been done in the past. In John Morley's brilliant sketch of Burke he lays especial stress upon the fact that Burke more than almost any other thinker or politician of his time realized the profound lesson that in politics we are concerned not with barren rights but with duties; not with abstract truth, but with practical morality. He especially eulogizes the way in which in his efforts for economic reform, Burke combined unshakable resolution in pressing the reform with a profound temperateness of spirit which made him, while bent on the extirpation of the evil system, refuse to cherish an unreasoning and vindictive ill-will toward the men who had benefited by it. Said Burke: "If I can not reform with equity, I will not reform at all. . . . (There is) a state to preserve as well as a state to reform."

This is the exact spirit in which this country

should move to the reform of abuses of corporate wealth. The wrong-doer, the man who swindles and cheats, whether on a big scale or a little one, shall receive at our hands mercy as scant as if he committed crimes of violence or brutality. We are unalterably determined to prevent wrong-doing in the future; we have no intention of trying to wreak such an indiscriminate vengeance for wrongs done in the past as would confound the innocent with the guilty. Our purpose is to build up rather than to tear down. We show ourselves the truest friends of property when we make it evident that we will not tolerate the abuses of property. We are steadily bent on preserving the institution of private property; we combat every tendency toward reducing the people to economic servitude; and we care not whether the tendency is due to a sinister agitation directed against all property, or whether it is due to the actions of those members of the predatory classes whose anti-social power is immeasurably increased because of the very fact that they possess wealth.

Above all, we insist that while facing changed conditions and new problems, we must face them in the spirit which our forefathers showed when they founded and preserved this Republic. The corner-stone of the Republic lies in our treating each man on his worth as a man, paying no heed to his creed, his birthplace, or his occupation, asking not whether he is rich or poor, whether he labors with head or hand; asking only whether he

acts decently and honorably in the various relations of his life, whether he behaves well to his family, to his neighbors, to the state. We base our regard for each man on the essentials and not the accidents. We judge him not by his professions, but by his deeds; by his conduct, not by what he has acquired of this world's goods. Other republics have fallen, because the citizens gradually grew to consider the interests of a class before the interests of the whole; for when such was the case it mattered little whether it was the poor who plundered the rich or the rich who exploited the poor; in either event the end of the republic was at hand. We are resolute in our purpose not to fall into such a pit. This great Republic of ours shall never become the government of a plutocracy, and it shall never become the government of a mob. God willing, it shall remain what our fathers who founded it meant it to be—a government in which each man stands on his worth as a man, where each is given the largest personal liberty consistent with securing the well-being of the whole, and where, so far as in us lies, we strive continually to secure for each man such equality of opportunity that in the strife of life he may have a fair chance to show the stuff that is in him. We are proud of our schools and of the trained intelligence they give our children the opportunity to acquire. But what we care for most is the character of the average man; for we believe that if the average of character in the individual citizen is sufficiently high, if he possesses

those qualities which make him worthy of respect in his family life and in his work outside, as well as the qualities which fit him for success in the hard struggle of actual existence—that if such is the character of our individual citizenship, there is literally no height of triumph unattainable in this vast experiment of government by, of, and for a free people.

AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE TO MAJOR-GENERAL GEORGE B. McCLELLAN AT WASHINGTON, MAY 2, 1907

Men of the Army of the Potomac, and you, my Friends and Fellow-Citizens:

It is with profound pleasure that, as President of the United States, I to-day take part in the unveiling of a monument to one of its leading soldiers of the Civil War. Naturally, on behalf of the Nation, I greet with peculiar pleasure Mrs. McClellan and her son on this occasion. Next only to them, I take special pleasure in greeting the comrades of General McClellan—you, the generals, the officers, and the enlisted men who fought under him in the mighty days.

Let me here, General King, express my peculiar appreciation of the honor conferred upon me in electing me to honorary membership in the Society of the Army of the Potomac—an honor previously conferred upon my lamented predecessor, President McKinley. The war that I took part in was a little war, but it was all the war there was; and we

tried to show that we at least had the desire to act as you men of the mighty days would wish those who came after you to act.

I desire also to say a special word of greeting to the Governor of New Jersey, and to the troops of New Jersey who have come here to pay homage to the memory of their revered fellow-citizen.

To General McClellan it was given to command in some of the hardest fought battles and most important campaigns in the great war of this hemisphere, so that his name will be forever linked with the mighty memories that arise when we speak of Antietam and South Mountain, Fair Oaks and Malvern; so that we never can speak of the great Army of the Potomac without having rise before us the figure of General McClellan, the man who organized and first led it. There was also given to him the peculiar gift, one that is possessed by but very few men, to combine the qualities that won him the enthusiastic love and admiration of the soldiers who fought with and under him, and the qualities that in civil life endeared him peculiarly to all who came in contact with him.

Let me say a word of acknowledgment of a special kind to the Committee who are responsible for the statue. It has been said of some modern statuary that it added a new terror to death. But I wish on behalf of those who live in the capital of the Nation to express my very profound acknowledgments to those who had the good taste to choose a great sculptor to do this work. I thank

them for having erected here in so well-chosen a site a statue which, not only because of the man it commemorates, but because of its own intrinsic worth, adds to the nobility and beauty of the capital city of the country.

As has been already well said to-day, you men of the great war, you veterans here, need no statue, need no shaft, to recall you to the memory of your fellow-countrymen. You have as your perpetual monument the country itself. We have to-day a country, a government, a national capital, a flag, only because of what you and your comrades did in the Civil War. Above all, you left us not merely the heritage left by all good soldiers to their country—the heritage of the right to take glory in your own achievements—but you have the peculiar honor, the peculiar good fortune, to leave to your countrymen the right to take pride also in the achievements of their fellow-countrymen who were at the time your gallant foes—the men who are now your brothers, knit by the events of that war with you, and their descendants with yours, in a real Union forever indissoluble. We have become accustomed to accepting as a matter of course certain things which would be wellnigh impossible in any country save ours, so that it seems most natural that the President of the United States, when he drives down to take part in a celebration like this, should have as his personal aides both the sons of the men who wore the blue and the sons of the men who wore the gray. As Americans, when we glory in

what was done under Grant, Sherman, Thomas, Sheridan, McClellan, Farragut, we can no less glory in the valor, and the devotion to duty as it was given to them to see the duty, of the men who fought under Lee and Stonewall Jackson and the Johnsons and Stewart and Morgan.

Men of the Army of the Potomac, not only have you left us a united land, not only have you left us the material heritage which your hands wrought, but you have left us by what you did in your lives certain lessons which apply as much in peace as in war—lessons which are sometimes only painfully learned in war, which are sometimes quickly forgotten in peace. First of all among these lessons necessary for our people to keep ever in mind, I would put the fact that the life worth living is the life of endeavor, the life of effort, the life of worthy strife to accomplish a worthy end.

We have listened recently to a great deal of talk about peace. It is the duty of all of us to strive for peace, provided that it comes on the right terms. I believe that the man who really does best work for the state in peace is the very man who at need will do well in war. If peace is merely another name for self-indulgence, for sloth, for timidity, for the avoidance of duty, have none of it. Seek the peace that comes to the just man armed, who will dare to defend his rights if the need should arise. Seek the peace granted to him who will wrong no man and will not submit to wrong in return. Seek the peace that comes to us as the

peace of righteousness, the peace of justice. Ask peace because your deeds and your powers warrant you in asking it, and do not put yourself in the position to crave it as something to be granted or withheld at the whim of another.

If there is one thing which we should wish as a Nation to avoid, it is the teaching of those who would reenforce the lower promptings of our hearts, and so teach us to seek only a life of effortless ease, of mere material comfort. The material development of this country, of which we have a right to be proud provided that we keep our pride rational and within measure, brings with it certain great dangers, and one of those dangers is the confounding of means and ends. Material development means nothing to a nation as an end in itself. If America is to stand simply for the accumulation of what tells for comfort and luxury, then it will stand for little indeed when looked at through the vistas of the ages. America will stand for much provided only that it treats material comfort, material luxury, and the means for acquiring such, as the foundation on which to build the real life, the life of spiritual and moral effort and achievement. The rich man who has done nothing but accumulate riches is entitled to but the scantiest consideration; to men of real power of discernment he is an object rather of contempt than of envy. The test of a fortune should be twofold—how it was earned and how it is spent. It is with the nation as it is with the individual. Looking back through his-

tory, the nation that we respect is invariably the nation that struggled, the nation that strove toward a high ideal, the nation that recognized in an obstacle something to be overcome and not something to be shirked. The nation is but the aggregate of the individuals, and what is true of national life is and must be true of each of us in his individual life. The man renders but a poor service to nation or to individual who preaches rest, ease, absence of endeavor, as what that nation or that individual should strive after. Both you men who fought in blue and your brothers who fought in gray against you, as you look back in your lives through the years that have passed, what is it in those years that you most glory in? The times of ease, the times of fatness, the times when everything went smoothly with you? Of course not, because you are men, because you are moved by the spirit of men. What you glory in, what you hope to hand down as undying memories to your children, are the things that were done in the days that brought little pleasure with them save the grim consciousness of having done each man his duty as his duty needed to be done. Because in those years you had it in you dauntlessly to do your share in the work allotted to you, your children and your children's children rise up to call you blessed. Who among you now would barter the memories of the dark years from '61 to '65 for any gift that could be given? Not a man among you. You have won the right to feel a pride that

none other of your countrymen can feel, and you won that right because you sought not the path of ease but the path of rough, disagreeable, irksome, and dangerous duty.

In life as it is to-day in time of peace we do not have to face the difficulties and dangers you had to face; but if we do not face the duties that are ours in your spirit, we shall do them but poorly. We are a good many thousand years short of the Millennium yet, both as among nations and as among individuals, and our business is to do our own duty and to teach our children to do their duty in a rough, workaday world; and we can not do that duty by fine phrases. There is no use in anything I say here being all right unless the deeds both of myself and yourselves correspond to the words I speak and to which you listen. That is all that words count for—as an index by which you can judge the corresponding deeds, either of the speaker or of the listeners. We can not do our duty if we let ourselves get a false perspective of life, if we substitute ease and pleasure for the conception of duty itself. That is just as true of the man and the woman in private life as it is of the soldier. Consider your friends and associates who were not in the army; take the younger people; look at each man and each woman when they have begun to be elderly, and compare in real happiness those who have gone through life shirking, getting around and avoiding what was disagreeable and unpleasant, with those who have faced and over-

come what was disagreeable and unpleasant, and you will find that it is the last class who have had the real enjoyment.

There is just one person in this country whom I put ahead of any soldier, I do not care whether the soldier wore the blue or whether he wore the gray; I do not care whether he fought through the Civil War, not even if he lost an arm in the Civil War—I put ahead of the soldier the really good woman, the good wife and mother, who has done her full duty. She often has a pretty hard time; each man here knows that it is the woman who often has to do harder work than the hardest-worked man; and therefore the man worth the name will always show a peculiar consideration and tenderness for his helpmeet, for all the women of his household. The man at least has his nights to himself, and the woman with children does not. She has to take care of the children in sickness, she has a greater responsibility for raising them, for giving them the proper training, than the man can possibly have. Yet the woman who thus with labor and anxiety brings up her children is blessed among women, blessed among men. I do not pity her in the least. I respect and admire her, and hold her worthy of admiration and honor. The selfish creature, man or woman, who reaches old age having achieved ease by shirking duty, is to be heartily despised and not envied. Our admiration is reserved for him or for her who has done the real work which makes the next

generation able in its turn to do its work in the country.

I wish to see the people of this country not merely feel kindly toward their neighbors who do well; for I also wish to see them actuated by a flaming indignation toward their neighbors who do ill. I wish to see you peaceful, and desirous each to avoid harming his neighbor; and I wish to see you able and desirous each to see that your neighbor does not harm you. A foolish good-nature, a weak good-nature, incapable of righteous wrath, is almost as unfortunate an attribute for a citizen of this democracy as willingness to do wrong on the part of the man himself. If the man hasn't in him the power of being aroused to vehement action when wrong has been done, he can be of no service in combating the manifold wrongs that do exist at present alike in our industrial and in our economic life. The public servant who is only good-natured and well-meaning is not a very useful public servant. If you haven't got it in you to strive manfully against wrong, you will accomplish but little for right.

The qualities needed to make a good soldier, in their final analysis, are the qualities needed to make a good citizen; and the qualities needed alike by soldier in time of war and by all citizens in time of peace are those which in their sum make up the characteristics that tell for a great and righteous people. America must rise level to the ideals of the founders of the Nation when they started this

mighty Republic on the road of self-government. Those ideals in their sum were to found here a government of the people, by the people, where no one man should wrong his brother, where the Nation should wrong no outsider, and should be able to resist aggression from without. I hope to see this Nation play an ever-growing part in the affairs of the world. It can not play that part unless it is willing to accept the responsibilities that go with it. We can not do our first and primary duty at home within our own borders unless we strive measurably to realize certain ideals. By this I do not mean merely to talk about them at Fourth of July celebrations; to speak of them, and applaud the speech, and then go home and have neither speaker nor hearer practice what has thus virtuously been preached. We should say and applaud only what we believe in. And having said it, and having applauded it when said, we should try to put it into practice. When we speak of liberty, when we praise it, let us try to see that in actual practice we achieve it. When we speak of fraternity, of brotherhood, let us exercise each for himself the qualities that make for brotherhood, for fraternity. When we speak of equality, let us try to realize it in the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, who pointed out that there was, of course, a certain sense in which men are not, and can not be, equal; but who realized by his life and his deeds the profound truth that in the larger sense, in the real, the all-important sense, there can and must be an equality among all men.

This equality we, of the American Republic, must seek to secure among our fellow-citizens. It is an equality of rights before the law; a measurable equality of opportunity, so far as we can secure it, for each man to do the best that there is in him without harming his fellows, and without hindrance from his fellows; and finally, and most important, it is that equality which we should prize above all else, the equality of self-respect and of mutual respect among each and all of our citizens.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON,
May 2, 1907

MY DEAR MR. HENRY:

When you, in company with Messrs. Coakley and Brown, called upon me this morning, I read you the letter I had written to the Attorney-General on March 25, 1906. At your request I gladly send you the following extract from that letter:

"[Our duty is] if it should ever happen that we had any power in the matter, to see that exact justice is done these men. There must be no condonation of lawlessness on our part, even if the lawlessness takes the form of an effort to avenge the wrongs committed by the lawlessness of others. The sole question as regards Haywood and Moyer must be the question whether or not they can be shown to be guilty of this particular act, and their legal rights must be as carefully safeguarded as those of any other men. It is alleged that they were extradited from Colorado in a manner that

amounted to a betrayal of their legal rights. I should like to have the District Attorney of Colorado, and if necessary the District Attorney of Idaho, give me such information as they can on this point. I should like to get from the District Attorney of Idaho any information that he can obtain as to whether or not there has been the slightest disposition shown by the authorities in Idaho to act toward these men in an unfair or improper manner, or to deny them their legal rights. On the other hand, I should like to know whether there is any symptom of a miscarriage of justice in their favor. . . . The intemperate violence with which Socialistic or labor papers like that of Debs, and I am sorry to say some labor organizations, have insisted without any knowledge of the facts upon treating these men as martyrs to the cause of labor, has unquestionably resulted in tremendous pressure being brought to bear upon the authorities of Idaho to discharge or acquit them whether guilty or innocent. . . . So far as the unions are anxious only to see that exact justice is done these men, that they are given their full legal rights and not condemned unless proved guilty of this specific act, they are entitled to the cordial co-operation of all just and fair-minded citizens. So far as by any action, or by murderous and treasonable language such as that quoted above from Debs (and others), they tend to bring pressure to bear upon the State authorities and the courts, to obstruct the course of justice, and to render it difficult to convict the men if guilty,

they are equally without stint to be condemned; and anything that the Federal authorities can do, in either event, to further the cause of justice is to be done."

In response to your question it is, I trust, needless for me to say that if at any time you or any one else can submit to me any evidence showing that there has been a miscarriage of justice for or against Messrs. Moyer or Haywood, which you believe it is in my power to remedy, I will at once bring such evidence to the attention of the Attorney-General to have him give it the fullest consideration and to take thereon such action, if any, as it may be in the power of the Federal authorities to take.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

MR. JOHN S. HENRY,
1220 Third Avenue, New York.

AT THE GRADUATING EXERCISES OF FRIENDS' SCHOOL, WASHINGTON, MAY 24, 1907

Mr. Sidwell and Pupils:

When I speak of the American boy, what I say really applies to the grown-ups nearly as much as to the boys. I want to see every one of you boys enjoy himself to the full, and yet remember that he won't enjoy himself if he does not do real work. It is not the boy who shirks his lessons, who shirks doing his work, who ultimately has a good time. I remember once talking with a great friend of mine, a professor in Yale, about a certain boy who had been put on the Yale football eleven early in the season; I said that I had happened to know his father, and that I hoped the boy would do well. My friend, the professor, answered: "You will find he won't do well; that fellow has not got the right stuff in him; he will not keep up with his studies, and my experience has always been if a boy has not the character to study he won't have the character to persevere in the game." The professor was exactly right. The boy was dropped before the end of the season. He did not have the right stuff in him; and exactly as it had shown itself in his not keeping decently up with his studies, so it showed itself in making him quite unable to do his work on the team. I want to see each of you play hard when you play; and I want to see each of you work hard, and not play at all, when you work. I want to see a man work, but if he is

the kind of man who is wholly unable ever to enjoy a holiday, he is apt to be a pretty poor father, a pretty poor citizen. Let him work hard, and let him remember to enjoy the other side of life too.

I want to see you game, boys; I want to see you brave and manly; and I also want to see you gentle and tender. In other words, you should make it your object to be the right kind of boys at home, so that your family will feel a genuine regret, instead of a sense of relief, when you stay away; and at the same time you must be able to hold your own in the outside world. You can not do that if you have not manliness, courage in you. It does no good to have either of those two sets of qualities if you lack the other. I do not care how nice a little boy you are, how pleasant at home, if when you are out you are afraid of other little boys lest they be rude to you; for if so you will not be a very happy boy nor grow up a very useful man. When a boy grows up I want him to be of such a type that when somebody wrongs him he will feel a good, healthy desire to show the wrong-doers that he can not be wronged with impunity. I like to have the man who is a citizen feel, when a wrong is done to the community by any one, when there is an exhibition of corruption or betrayal of trust, or demagogy or violence, or brutality, not that he is shocked and horrified and would like to go home; but I want to have him feel the determination to put the wrong-doer down, to make the man who does wrong aware that the decent man is not only his superior in decency,

but his superior in strength; not necessarily physical strength, but strength of character, the kind of strength that makes a good and forceful citizen.

The place in which each of you should try to be most useful is his own home, and each of you should wish for and should practice in order to have courage and strength, so that they can be used in protecting the gentle, in protecting the weak, against those who would wrong weakness and gentleness. The boy who will maltreat either a smaller child, a little boy or a little girl, or a dumb animal, is just about the meanest boy that you can find anywhere in the world. You should be brave and able to hold your own just because you should be able to put down such a bully. It should be your pride to be the champion of the weak. You will find a certain number of boys who have strength and who pride themselves in it, and who misuse it. The boy who will torture something harmless, who will oppress the boy or girl who is weak, or do wrong to those who can not resist, almost always proves to have a weak streak in him, and not to have the stuff in him that would make him stand up to an equal foe under punishment. That boy has not real courage, real strength; and much though I dislike seeing a boy who is timid, who is afraid, who can not hold his own, I dislike infinitely more, I abhor, the boy who uses strength and courage to oppress those who can not help themselves.

Now, one word to the grown-ups, to the fathers and especially to the mothers. Do remember that

in your homes it is just as important as in the outside world that you should have neither hardness of heart nor softness of head. The damage done to children by cold or unfeeling or selfish parents is not a bit greater than the damage done to them by foolish and weak and over-indulgent parents. A foolish indulgence is as bad as any harshness. In particular the mother who lets her boy grow up selfish, imposing on her, not showing tenderness or consideration for her or for others, is preparing to turn the selfish son into what will some day be a brutal and unfeeling husband and father. That woman is not showing real tenderness, real love for the boy; she is showing folly, and wicked folly at that. She is doing the worst that she can for the boy, and she is preparing misery and suffering for all those who come in contact with him thereafter. The men, and especially the women (for it is the woman who counts for most in the household), who fail to bring up their children so that they give a prompt and ready obedience, and show unselfishness and consideration for others—all of us need to be taught that, it does not come naturally—fail signally in their duty as fathers or mothers.

I shall quote, in closing, a bit of advice of which I have always been fond, gathered from the football field, and it applies just as much in after life as it does on a football team. In after life, as in your games, remember: "Don't flinch, don't foul, and hit the line hard."

AT INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MAY 30, 1907

For more than one reason I am peculiarly glad that this year I speak on Memorial Day in the State of Indiana. There is no other class of our citizens to whom we owe so much as to the veterans of the great war. To them it was given to perform the one feat with which no other feat can be compared, for to them it was given to preserve the Union. Moreover, you men who wore the blue, blessed beyond the victors in any other war of recent times, have left to your countrymen more than the material results of the triumph, more even than the achieving the triumph itself. You have left a country so genuinely reunited that all of us now, in whatever part of this Union we live, have a right to feel the keenest pride, not only in the valor and self-devotion of you, the gallant men who wore the blue, but also in the valor and self-devotion of your gallant opponents who wore the gray. The hero whose monument we to-day unveil, by his life bore singular testimony to the completeness of the reunion. General Lawton in his youth fought gallantly in the Civil War. Thirty-three years afterward he again marched to war, this time against a foreign foe, and served with distinguished ability and success as a general officer, both in Cuba and in the Philippines. When he thus served it was in an army whose generals included not only many of his old comrades in arms, but some of his old opponents also, as General Wheeler and General Fitzhugh Lee. Under him, both among the commissioned officers and in the

ranks, were many men whose fathers had worn the blue serving side by side with others whose fathers had worn the gray; but all Americans now, and nothing but Americans, all united in their fealty and devotion to their common flag and their common country, and each knowing only the generous rivalry with his fellows as to who could best serve the cause for which each was ready to lay down life itself. To General Lawton it befell actually to lay down his life; a tragedy, but one of those noble tragedies where our pride rises above our sorrow. For he died in the fulness of time, serving his country with entire devotion—a death that every man may well envy.

Indiana in the Civil War furnished even more than her share of brave soldiers. It also fell to Indiana to furnish the greatest of all the war governors who upheld the hands of Abraham Lincoln; for when history definitely awards the credit for what was done in the Civil War, she will put the services of no other civilian, save alone those of Lincoln, ahead of the services of Governor Morton. No other man who rendered such services as he rendered worked under such terrible disadvantages; and no man without his iron power could have achieved what he achieved during the last two years of the war, when he managed the State Government of Indiana solely on money obtained by pledging his own personal honor and personal fortune, and yet never for one moment relaxed in the help he gave to Lincoln and Chase and Seward and Stanton in the Cabinet, to Grant and Sherman and Sheridan

and Thomas in the field. It was work that only the strongest man could have done, and it was work vitally necessary for the sake of the Nation.

The men of the generation which fought the Civil War had their great tasks to perform. They met them as strong men should have met them. They did them, and we, their children, profit by their mighty deeds. But no generation can ever plead the great deeds of its predecessors as an excuse for failing to perform its own duties. Our duties are those of peace and not of war. Nevertheless they are of the utmost importance; of importance to ourselves, and of still greater importance to the children who in a few years will take our places as the men and women of this Republic. If we wish to show ourselves worthy heirs of the men of the Civil War, we must do our tasks with the thoroughness with which they did theirs.

Great social and industrial problems confront us, and their solution demands on our part unfaltering courage, and yet a wise, good-natured self-restraint; so that on the one hand we shall neither be daunted by difficulties nor fooled by those who would seek to persuade us that the difficulties are insuperable; while on the other hand we are not misled into showing either rashness or vindictiveness. Let us try as a people to show the same qualities as we deal with the industrial and social problems of to-day that Abraham Lincoln showed when with indomitable resolution, but with a kindliness, patience, and common-sense quite as remarkable, he faced

four weary years of open war in front, of calumny, detraction, and intrigue from behind, and at the end gave to his countrymen whom he had served so well the blood-bought gift of a race freed and a nation forever united.

One great problem that we have before us is to preserve the rights of property; and these can only be preserved if we remember that they are in less jeopardy from the Socialist and the Anarchist than from the predatory man of wealth. It has become evident that to refuse to invoke the power of the Nation to restrain the wrongs committed by the man of great wealth who does evil is not only to neglect the interests of the public, but is to neglect the interests of the man of means who acts honorably by his fellows. The power of the Nation must be exerted to stop crimes of cunning no less than crimes of violence. There can be no halt in the course we have deliberately elected to pursue, the policy of asserting the right of the Nation, so far as it has the power, to supervise and control the business use of wealth, especially in its corporate form. To-day I wish to say a word to you about the first and most important feature of this task, the control of the common carriers doing an interstate business, a control absolutely vested in the Nation; while in so far as the common carriers also transport the mails, it is in my opinion probable that whether their business is or is not interstate, it is to the same extent subject to Federal control, under that clause of the Constitution granting to

the National Government power to establish post roads, and therefore by necessary implication power to take all action necessary in order to keep them at the highest point of efficiency.

Every Federal law dealing with corporations or with railroads that has been put upon the statute books during the last six years has been a step in advance in the right direction. All action taken by the Administration under these and the pre-existing laws has been just and proper. Every suit undertaken during that period has been a suit not merely warranted, but required, by the facts; a suit in the interest of the people as a whole, and, in the long run, particularly in the interest of stockholders as well as in the interest of business men of property generally. There can be no swerving from the course that has thus been mapped out in the legislation actually enacted and in the messages in which I have asked for further legislation. We best serve the interests of the honest railway men when we announce that we will follow out precisely this course. It is the course of real, of ultimate conservatism. There will be no halt in the forward movement toward a full development of this policy; and those who wish us to take a step backward or to stand still, if their wishes were realized, would find that they had invited an outbreak of the very radicalism they fear. There must be progressive legislative and administrative action for the correction of the evils which every sincere man must admit to have existed in railroad management in the past.

Such additional legislation as that for which I have asked in the past, and especially that for which I asked in my message at the opening of the last session of Congress, is not merely in the interest of the public, but most emphatically in the interest of every honest railway manager and of all investors or would-be investors in railway securities. There must be vested in the Federal Government a full power of supervision and control over the railways doing interstate business; a power in many respects analogous to and as complete as that the Government exercises over the national banks. It must possess the power to exercise supervision over the future issuance of stocks and bonds, either through a national corporation (which I should prefer) or in some similar fashion, such supervision to include the frank publicity of everything which would-be investors and the public at large have a right to know. The Federal Government will thus be able to prevent all overcapitalization in the future; to prevent any man hereafter from plundering others by loading railway properties with obligations and pocketing the money instead of spending it in improvements and in legitimate corporate purposes; and any man acting in such fashion should be held to a criminal accountability. It should be declared contrary to public policy henceforth to allow railroads to devote their capital to anything but the transportation business, certainly not to the hazards of speculation. For the very reason that we desire to favor the honest railroad

manager, we should seek to discourage the activities of the man whose only concern with railroads is to manipulate their stocks. The business of railroad organization and management should be kept entirely distinct from investment or brokerage business especially of the speculative type, and the credit and property of the corporation should be devoted to the extension and betterment of its railroads, and to the development of the country naturally tributary to the lines. These principles are fundamental. Railroads should not be prohibited from acquiring connecting lines, by acquiring stocks, bonds, or other securities of such lines; but it is already well settled as contrary to public policy to allow railroads to acquire control over parallel and competing lines of transportation. Subject to first giving to the Government the power of supervision and control which I have advocated above, the law should be amended so that railroads may be permitted and encouraged to make traffic agreements when these are in the interest of the general public as well as of the railroad corporations making them. These agreements should of course be made public in the minutest detail, and should be subject to securing the previous assent of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The movement to regulate railways by law has come to stay. The people of this country have made up their minds—and wisely made up their minds—to exercise a closer control over all kinds of public-service corporations, including railways.

Every honestly managed railway will gain and not lose by the policy. The men more anxious to manipulate stocks than to make the management of their roads efficient and honest are the only ones who have cause to oppose it.

We who believe in steady and healthy progress stand unalterably for the new era of the widest publicity, and of fair dealing on the part of railroads with stockholders, passengers, and shippers. We ask the consent of no man in carrying out this policy; but we gladly welcome the aid of every man in perfecting the law in its details and in securing its enactment and the faithful observance of its wise provisions. We seek nothing revolutionary. We ask for such laws as in their essence now obtain in the staid old Commonwealth of Massachusetts; such laws as now obtain in England. The purpose of those of us who so resolutely believe in the new policy, in its thorough carrying out, and in its progressive development, is in no sense punitive or vindictive. We would be the first to protest against any form of confiscation of property, and whether we protested or not, I may add that the Supreme Court could be trusted in any event to see that there should be nothing done under the guise of regulating roads to destroy property without just compensation or without due process of law. As a matter of course, we shall punish any criminal whom we can convict under the law; but we have no intention of confounding the innocent many and the guilty few by any ill-judged and sweeping scheme of

vengeance. Our aim is primarily to prevent these abuses in the future. Wherever evil-doers can be, they shall be, brought to justice; and no criminal, high or low, whom we can reach will receive immunity. But the rights of innocent investors should not be jeoparded by legislation or executive action; we sanction no legislation which would fall heavily on them, instead of on the original wrong-doers or beneficiaries of the wrong.

There must be no such rigid laws as will prevent the development of the country, and such development can only be had if investors are offered an ample reward for the risk they take. We would be the first to oppose any unreasonable restrictions being placed upon the issuance of stocks and bonds, for such would simply hamper the growth of the United States; for a railroad must ultimately stand on its credit. But this does not prevent our demanding that there be lodged in the Government power to exercise a jealous care against the inflation of securities, and all the evils that come in its train. The man who builds a great railway and those who invest in it render a great public service; for adequate transportation facilities are a vital necessity to the country. We favor full and ample return to such men; but we do not favor a policy of exploiting the many for the benefit of the few. We favor the railway man who operates his railway upon a straightforward and open business basis, from the standpoint of permanent investment, and who has an interest in its future; we are against only the man who cares nothing

for the property after his speculative deal in its securities has been closed. We favor the railway manager who keeps in close touch with the people along his line rather than in close touch with the speculative market; who operates his line with a view to the advantage he can legitimately get out of his railway as a permanent investment by giving a fair return to the stockholders and to the public good service with reasonable rates; who does not operate his road with a view to the temporary speculative advantage which will follow capitalizing an uncertain future and unloading the securities on the public. We wish to make it to the interest of the investor to put his money into the honest development of the railroads, and therefore we wish to discriminate against the man who, while enriching himself, lays upon the future owners and patrons of the road and above all upon the honest men whose duty it may become to operate the road, a burden of additional debt without adding correspondingly to its actual worth. Much is said about the inability of railway presidents to agree among themselves as to what policy should be advocated and what plans followed in the effort to work out the problems which now present themselves. In so far as the law is concerned, all I ask of them is a willingness to comply fully with its spirit, and a readiness to move along the lines indicated by those who are charged with administering it. Our policy is built upon experience, and our primary purpose is to ensure the future against the mistakes and delinquencies of the past.

There has been much wild talk as to the extent of the overcapitalization of our railroads. The census reports on the commercial value of the railroads of the country, together with the reports made to the Interstate Commerce Commission by the railroads on their cost of construction, tend to show that as a whole the railroad property of the country is worth as much as the securities representing it, and that in the consensus of opinion of investors the total value of stock and bonds is greater than their total face value, notwithstanding the "water" that has been injected in particular places. The huge value of terminals, the immense expenditures in recent years in double tracking, improving grades, roadbeds, and structures, have brought the total investments to a point where the opinion that the real value is greater than the face value is probably true. No general statement such as this can be accepted as having more than a general value; there are many exceptions; but the evidence seems ample that the great mass of railroad securities rest upon safe and solid foundations; if they fail in any degree to command complete public confidence, it is because isolated instances of unconscionable stock-watering and kindred offences arouse suspicion, which naturally extends to all other corporate securities so long as similar practices are possible and the tendency to resort to them is unrestrained by law. While there have been many instances of gross and flagrant stock inflation, and while, of course, there remain cases of overcapitalization, yet when the statistics of

the weaker roads, the overcapitalized roads, are combined with those of the stronger roads, and considered in the aggregate, in my judgment they will not be found to impair the wholesome financial standing and position of the railroads as a whole; and while those railway owners and managers who have enriched themselves by loading their properties with securities representing little or no real value deserves our strongest condemnation, on the other hand our hearty commendation is due those owners and managers—representing, I believe, the large majority—who have year after year worked faithfully, patiently, and honestly in building up our great system of railways, which has knitted together in close commercial and social intercourse widely removed sections of the country and stands second only to the great business of agriculture itself in contribution to national growth and development.

Ample provision should be made by Congress to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission, by the employment of a sufficient force of experts, to undertake the physical valuation of each and any road in the country, whenever and so soon as in the opinion of the Commission such a valuation of any road would be of value to the Commission in its work. There are undoubtedly some roads as to which it would be an advantage, from the standpoint of the business of the Commission, to have such a physical valuation as soon as possible.

At the outset let it be understood that physical valuation is no panacea; it is no sufficient measure-

ment of a rate; but it will be ultimately needed as an essential instrument in administrative supervision. It will be of use to the Commission in connection with the duty of determining the reasonableness of future capitalization, both as one element to enable such a body to come to a right conclusion in the matter, and also as an element to be placed before the investing public, to enable this public in its turn to reach a conclusion; though of course capitalization must be determined in large measure by future need rather than past investment. How important physical valuation will prove as one of the factors to assist in fixing equitable rates, I am not able to judge; but that it will be of a certain importance can be safely assumed because of the opinions of the Interstate Commerce Commission and of the courts, and because of the recent action of the Northern Pacific Railroad in advancing such a physical valuation as decisive on its side in a rate controversy. Such a valuation would necessarily help to protect the railroads against the making of inadequate and unjust rates, and would therefore be as important from the standpoint of the protection of the railroads as from the standpoint of the protection of the public; and of course it is necessary to the enduring prosperity and development of the country that the railroads shall yield reasonable profits to investors. It is from one standpoint quite as important to know the original cost of the building of the road as to know what it would now cost to reproduce it; from another

standpoint the human equation—that is, the management of the road—is more important by far than the physical valuation; and the physical valuation of the road in one region may have an entirely different relation to the real value of the road than in another region where the conditions are utterly different. Therefore the physical valuation can never be more than one of many elements to be considered; but it is one element, and at times may be a very important element, when taken in connection with the earning power, franchises, original cost, character of management, location, and business possibilities, in reaching an estimate on the property and rights of a corporation as a going concern.

The effect of such valuation and supervision of securities can not be retroactive. Existing securities should be tested by the laws in existence at the time of their issue. This Nation would no more injure securities which have become an important part of the national wealth than it would consider a proposition to repudiate the public debt. But the public interest requires guaranty against improper multiplication of securities in the future. Reasonable regulations for their issuance should be provided, so as to secure as far as may be that the proceeds thereof shall be devoted to legitimate business purposes. In providing against overcapitalization we shall harm no human being who is honest; and we shall benefit many, for overcapitalization often means an inflation that invites business panic; it always conceals the true relation of the profit

earned to the capital invested, creating a burden of interest payments which may redound to the loss alike of the wage-earner and the general public, which is concerned in the rates paid by shippers; it damages the small investor, discourages thrift, and puts a premium on gambling and business trickery.

There is an essential difference between private and quasi-public property which justifies setting somewhere a limit beyond which the accumulating value in quasi-public properties, due to the necessity of a growing community, shall not be capitalized.

One of the most important features of the Hepburn Act is its having given the Commission absolute control over the accounts of railways. The Commission has just issued an order to the effect that on July 1 next all the railways of the country subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission must standardize their accounting methods, and the Commission is now organizing a bureau of special examiners, whose duty it will be, among other things, to see that the books of the carriers are kept in conformity with the rules laid down by the Commission. Thus the means are already at hand and the machinery already created which, when perfected, will put the public in position to know the facts, so that the small investor can exercise an intelligent judgment when entrusting his money to the promoters of great railway enterprises. We hope as one of the chief means for betterment of conditions to secure as complete publicity in the affairs of railroads as now obtains with regard to national banks.

There need be no fear on the part of investors that this movement for national supervision and control over railways will be for their detriment. If they doubt this, let them study the history of the railway-control movement in such a State as Iowa. It would be hard to find anywhere a more prosperous or more intelligent community; a community of thriving farmers and thriving townspeople. Iowa did its share in the work of building railroads when the business was one that demanded men of the utmost daring and resourcefulness; men like that gallant soldier and real captain of industry, Grenville M. Dodge; men who ran risks and performed feats for which it was difficult to make the reward too high; men who staked everything on the chances of a business which to-day happily involves no such hazards. Iowa was at length forced to undertake the work of regulating the railways within her borders. There was great outcry against it. It was proclaimed that such effort would ruin roads already built, and prevent building more. But Iowa proceeded with the task, and it resulted, not in ruin and stagnation, but in increased safety and profit to the honest investor. Instead of putting roads into the hands of receivers, it was followed by a prosperity that rescued many of them from receiverships.

No State, of course, can do for the railways what the National Government has already done for the banks, and that Government should do something analogous for the railways. National bank stocks are bought and sold largely on the certificate of

character which the Government, as a result of its examinations and supervision, gives to them. To give another illustration from Iowa's experience, when the national banking law was amended to allow small banks to take out national charters, great numbers of the State banks of that State were reorganized into national institutions. The investing public was ready to back with unlimited confidence the institutions on which the Federal Government had set the seal of its confidence and approval. The railways have not been given this certificate of character, under the seal of the National Government, and therefore many people who invest freely in the shares of banks are reluctant to buy railroad securities. Give them the same guarantees as to railroad securities which we now give them as to national bank shares, and we would presently see these people investing in railroads, and thus opening a new reservoir from which to draw the capital now so much needed for the extension and betterment of the railroads.

All this, my friends, is substantially what I have said over and over again. Surely, it ought not to be necessary to say that it in no shape or way represents any hostility to corporations as such. On the contrary, it means a frank recognition of the fact that combinations of capital, like combinations of labor, are a natural result of modern conditions and of our national development. As far as in my ability lies my endeavor is and will be to prevent abuse of power by either and to favor both so long as they do well. The aim of the National Govern-

ment is quite as much to favor and protect honest corporations, honest business men of wealth, as to bring to justice those individuals and corporations representing dishonest methods. Most certainly there will be no relaxation by the Government authorities in the effort to get at any great railroad wrecker—any man who by clever swindling devices robs investors, oppresses wage-workers, and does injustice to the general public. But any such move as this is in the interest of honest railway operators, of honest corporations, and of those who when they invest their small savings in stocks and bonds, wish to be assured that these will represent money honestly expended for legitimate business purposes. To confer upon the National Government the power for which I ask would be a check upon overcapitalization and upon the clever gamblers who benefit by overcapitalization. But it alone would mean an increase in the value, an increase in the safety of the stocks and bonds of law-abiding, honestly managed railroads, and would render it far easier to market their securities. I believe in proper publicity. There has been complaint of some of the investigations recently carried on, but those who complain should put the blame where it belongs—upon the misdeeds which are done in darkness, and not upon the investigations which brought them to light. The Administration is responsible for turning on the light, but it is not responsible for what the light showed. I ask for full power to be given the Federal Government, because no single State can by legislation effectually

cope with these powerful corporations engaged in interstate commerce, and, while doing them full justice, exact from them in return full justice to others. The conditions of railroad activity, the conditions of our immense interstate commerce, are such as to make the central government alone competent to exercise full supervision and control.

The grave abuses in individual cases of railroad management in the past represent wrongs not merely to the general public, but, above all, wrongs to fair-dealing and honest corporations and men of wealth, because they excite a popular anger and distrust which from the very nature of the case tends to include in the sweep of its resentment good and bad alike. From the standpoint of the public I can not too earnestly say that as soon as the natural and proper resentment aroused by these abuses becomes indiscriminate and unthinking, it also becomes not merely unwise and unfair, but calculated to defeat the very ends which those feeling it have in view. There has been plenty of dishonest work by corporations in the past. There will not be the slightest let-up in the effort to hunt down and punish every dishonest man. But the bulk of our business is honestly done. In the natural indignation the people feel over the dishonesty, it is all-essential that they should not lose their heads and get drawn into an indiscriminate raid upon all corporations, all people of wealth, whether they do well or ill. Out of any such wild movement good will not come, can not come, and never has come. On the

contrary, the surest way to invite reaction is to follow the lead of either demagogue or visionary in a sweeping assault upon property values and upon public confidence, which would work incalculable damage in the business world, and would produce such distrust of the agitators that in the revulsion the distrust would extend to honest men who, in sincere and sane fashion, are trying to remedy the evils.

The great need of the hour, from the standpoint of the general public—of the producer, consumer, and shipper alike—is the need for better transportation facilities, for additional tracks, additional terminals, and improvements in the actual handling of the railroads; and all this with the least possible delay. Ample, safe, and rapid transportation facilities are even more necessary than cheap transportation. The prime need is for the investment of money which will provide better terminal facilities, additional tracks, and a greater number of cars and locomotives, while at the same time securing, if possible, better wages and shorter hours for the employees. There must be just and reasonable regulation of rates, but any arbitrary and unthinking movement to cut them down may be equivalent to putting a complete stop to the effort to provide better transportation.

There can be no question as to the desirability of doing away with rebates or any method of favoring one shipper at the expense of a competitor, and direct dealing with the rates is sometimes the only

method by which this favoritism can be avoided; but where favoritism is not alleged, and when the question is nakedly one of getting a lower rate, it must be remembered that it is often possible that those demanding it may be diametrically opposed in interest to those who demand a better, safer, and more rapid transportation service, and higher wages and shorter hours for employees. If the demand for more taxes, for higher wages, for shorter hours for employees, and for lower rates becomes so excessive as to prevent ample and speedy transportation, and to eat up the legitimate profits; if popular and legislative movements take a shape so ill-directed as not only to threaten honest investments and honest enterprises, but also to prevent any effort for the betterment of transportation facilities, it then becomes out of the question to secure the necessary investment of capital in order to bring about an improved service. Rates should not be unduly high; there should be a thorough safeguarding against accidents; there should be no improper shirking of taxes; the shippers of the country must be supplied generously with cars and all other equipments necessary to properly care for our commerce, and all this means that the National Government must be given full and effective power of supervision and control. But the interests of those who build, who manage, and who invest in the railroads must be no less scrupulously guarded than the interests of the public. It is urgently necessary at the present time, in order to relieve the

existing congestion of business and to do away with the paralysis which threatens our expanding industries, because of limited and inefficient means of distribution, that our railway facilities should be so increased as to meet the imperative demands of our internal commerce. The want can be met only by private capital, and the vast expenditure necessary for such purpose will not be incurred unless private capital is afforded reasonable incentive and protection. It is therefore a prime necessity to allow investments in railway properties to earn a liberal return, a return sufficiently liberal to cover all risks. We can not get an improved service unless the carriers of the country can sell their securities; and therefore nothing should be done unwarrantedly to impair their credit nor to decrease the value of their outstanding obligations.

I emphatically believe that positive restraint should be imposed upon railway corporations, and that they should be required to meet positive obligations in the interest of the general public. I no less emphatically believe that in thus regulating and controlling the affairs of the railways it is necessary to recognize the need of an immense outlay of money from private sources, and the certainty that this will not be met without the assurance of sufficient reward to induce the necessary investment. It is plainly inadvisable for the Government to undertake to direct the physical operation of the railways, save in wholly exceptional cases; and the supervision and control it exercises should be both en-

tirely adequate to secure its ends, and yet no more harassing than is necessary to secure these ends.

I believe that the railroad men of the United States are coming to a more perfect sense of the responsibility of the relation which they bear to the public, and of the dignity of that relation. They are public servants in the highest and fullest sense. Indeed, there is not a brakeman nor a switchman upon the most remote road in the land who does not fill a public function and render a service of large public usefulness. We begrudge neither honor nor reward to these men to whom we entrust our lives and our property. Behind these active workers in the railroad field are those who have the determination of railroad policies. These men are entitled to great rewards; and in return public opinion is right in holding them to a rigid accountability for the way they perform their public duties. For several months past some, if not all, of our roads have been in a condition of extreme congestion. Doubtless this is mainly due to the fact that the country has outgrown its railroads, that our prosperity has increased at such a rate that the most sanguine and optimistic railroads have been unable to keep pace with its growth. But it is also true that ordinary methods of operation, which hold good in a placid time of steady and regular movement, should at a time of crisis yield to the imperative necessities of public need.

The experience of the past winter proves how great is our dependence on the railroads and how

serious the responsibility of those who undertake to care for the public in the matter of transportation. I believe that there is sufficient ingenuity and executive genius in the operating officials of the roads greatly to diminish the troubles complained of. The most effective way to lessen demands for unreasonable legislation is for the railroads acting individually and collectively to remedy as many as possible of the abuses and shortcomings for which there really are remedies, and for which remedial laws are demanded by the shipping public.

The admirable national legislation of recent years, in taking away from the railroads the power of giving illegal favor, has taken away from them one of the illegitimate methods by which they used to protect themselves from improper attack; and it is therefore necessary that upright public servants should be as vigilant to protect them against harm as to prevent them from doing harm. Undoubtedly many high officers among the railroad men have followed the extremely unwise course of endeavoring to defeat the enactment of proper laws for their own control, and of endeavoring to thwart, obstruct, and bring into discredit the administration of the laws. But the folly of some of their number in no way alters our duty, nor the wisdom of performing this duty in a spirit of absolute justice alike to the railroad, the shipper, and the general public.

Finally, friends, let us never forget that this is not merely a matter of business but also a matter

of morals. The success of our whole system of government depends upon our discriminating between men, not with reference to whether they are rich or poor, whether they follow one occupation or another, but with reference solely to whether they act as honest and upright citizens should act. Let the local attorneys of the big roads keep out of politics; and when they have to appear before the National or any State Legislature let their names be put on a special register, and let their business be above-board and open. There are blackmailers in public life, and the citizen who is honest will war against the man who tries to blackmail a railroad or a big corporation with the same stern determination to punish him as against the man who corruptly favors such corporation. But let the railroad man remember that to purchase immunity in wrong-doing or to defeat blackmail by bribery is the worst and most shortsighted of policies. Let the plain people insist on the one hand on governing themselves and on the other hand on doing exact justice to the railways. Let the big railroad man scrupulously refrain from any effort to influence politics or government save as it is the duty of every good citizen in legitimate ways to try to influence politics and government; let the people as a whole, in their turn, remember that it is their duty to discriminate in the sharpest way between the railway man who does well and the railway man who does ill; and, above all, to remember that the irreparable moral harm done to the body politic by

corruption is just as great, whether the corruption takes the form of blackmailing a big corporation or of corruptly doing its bidding. What we have to demand in ourselves and in our public servants is honesty—honesty to all men; and if we condone dishonesty because we think it is exercised in the interests of the people, we may rest assured that the man thus showing it lacks only the opportunity to exercise it against the interests of the people. The man who on occasion will corruptly do what is wrong in the interests of a big corporation is the very man eager to blackmail that corporation as the opportunity arises. The man who is on occasion a corruptionist is apt, when the gust of popular feeling blows hard against the corporations he has corruptly served, to be the loudest, most reckless, and most violent among those who denounce them. Hunt such a man out of public life. Hunt him out as remorselessly if he is a blackmailer as if he stands corruptly for special privilege. Demand honesty—absolute, unflinching honesty—together with courage and common-sense, in public servant and in business man alike. Make it evident that you will not tolerate in public life a man who discriminates for or against any other, save as justice and reason demand it; and that in your attitude toward business men, toward the men who are dealing with the great financial interests of the country, while you intend to secure a sharp reckoning for the wrongdoers, you also intend heartily to favor the men who in legitimate ways are doing good work in the

business community—the railway president, the traffic manager, or other official, high or low, who is doing all in his power to handle his share in a vast and complicated business to the profit alike of the stockholder and the general public.

Let the man of great wealth remember that, while using and enjoying it, he must nevertheless feel that he is in a sense a trustee, and that consistent misuse, whether in acquiring or spending his wealth, is ominous of evil to himself, to others who have wealth, and to the Nation as a whole. As for the rest of us, let us guard ourselves against envy as we ask that others guard themselves against arrogance, and remember Lincoln's words of kindly wisdom: "Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

AT THE SEMICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE FOUNDING OF AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES IN THE UNITED STATES, AT LANSING, MICH., MAY 31, 1907

THE MAN WHO WORKS WITH HIS HANDS

The fiftieth anniversary of the founding of this college is an event of national significance, for Michigan was the first State in the Union to found this, the first agricultural college in America. The Nation is to be congratulated on the fact that the Congress at Washington has repeatedly enacted

laws designed to aid the several States in establishing and maintaining agricultural and mechanical colleges. I greet all such colleges, through their representatives who have gathered here to-day, and bid them Godspeed in their work. I no less heartily invoke success for the mechanical and agricultural schools; and I wish to say that I have heard particularly good reports of the Minnesota Agricultural High School for the way in which it sends its graduates back to the farms to work as practical farmers.

As a people there is nothing in which we take a juster pride than our educational system. It is our boast that every boy or girl has the chance to get a school training; and we feel it is a prime national duty to furnish this training free, because only thereby can we secure the proper type of citizenship in the average American. Our public schools and our colleges have done their work well, and there is no class of our citizens deserving of heartier praise than the men and women who teach in them.

Nevertheless, for at least a generation we have been waking to the knowledge that there must be additional education beyond that provided in the public school as it is managed to-day. Our school system has hitherto been wellnigh wholly lacking on the side of industrial training, of the training which fits a man for the shop and the farm. This is a most serious lack, for no one can look at the peoples of mankind as they stand at present without realizing

that industrial training is one of the most potent factors in national development. We of the United States must develop a system under which each individual citizen shall be trained so as to be effective individually as an economic unit, and fit to be organized with his fellows so that he and they can work in efficient fashion together. This question is vital to our future progress, and public attention should be focused upon it. Surely it is eminently in accord with the principles of our democratic life that we should furnish the highest average industrial training for the ordinary skilled workman. But it is a curious thing that in industrial training we have tended to devote our energies to producing high-grade men at the top rather than in the ranks. Our engineering schools, for instance, compare favorably with the best in Europe, whereas we have done almost nothing to equip the private soldiers of the industrial army—the mechanic, the metal-worker, the carpenter. Indeed, too often our schools train away from the shop and the forge; and this fact, together with the abandonment of the old apprentice system, has resulted in such an absence of facilities for providing trained journeymen that in many of our trades almost all the recruits among the workmen are foreigners. Surely this means that there must be some systematic method provided for training young men in the trades, and that this must be co-ordinated with the public-school system. No industrial school can turn out a finished journeyman; but

it can furnish the material out of which a finished journeyman can be made, just as an engineering school furnishes the training which enables its graduates speedily to become engineers.

We hear a great deal of the need of protecting our workingmen from competition with pauper labor. I have very little fear of the competition of pauper labor. The nations with pauper labor are not the formidable industrial competitors of this country. What the American workingman has to fear is the competition of the highly skilled workingman of the countries of greatest industrial efficiency. By the tariff and by our immigration laws we can always protect ourselves against the competition of pauper labor here at home; but when we contend for the markets of the world we can get no protection, and we shall then find that our most formidable competitors are the nations in which there is the most highly developed business ability, the most highly developed industrial skill; and these are the qualities which we must ourselves develop.

We have been fond as a Nation of speaking of the dignity of labor, meaning thereby manual labor. Personally I don't think that we begin to understand what a high place manual labor should take; and it never can take this high place unless it offers scope for the best type of man. We have tended to regard education as a matter of the head only, and the result is that a great many of our people, themselves the sons of men who worked with their

hands, seem to think that they rise in the world if they get into a position where they do no hard manual work whatever; where their hands will grow soft, and their working clothes will be kept clean. Such a conception is both false and mischievous. There are, of course, kinds of labor where the work must be purely mental, and there are other kinds of labor where, under existing conditions, very little demand indeed is made upon the mind, though I am glad to say that I think the proportion of men engaged in this kind of work is diminishing. But in any healthy community, in any community with the great solid qualities which alone make a really great nation, the bulk of the people should do work which makes demands upon both the body and the mind. Progress can not permanently consist in the abandonment of physical labor, but in the development of physical labor so that it shall represent more and more the work of the trained mind in the trained body. To provide such training, to encourage in every way the production of the men whom it alone can produce, is to show that as a Nation we have a true conception of the dignity and importance of labor. The calling of the skilled tiller of the soil, the calling of the skilled mechanic, should alike be recognized as professions, just as emphatically as the callings of lawyer, of doctor, of banker, merchant, or clerk. The printer, the electrical worker, the house painter, the foundry man, should be trained just as carefully as the stenographer or the drug

clerk. They should be trained alike in head and in hand. They should get over the idea that to earn twelve dollars a week and call it "salary" is better than to earn twenty-five dollars a week and call it "wages." The young man who has the courage and the ability to refuse to enter the crowded field of the so-called professions and to take to constructive industry is almost sure of an ample reward in earnings, in health, in opportunity to marry early, and to establish a home with reasonable freedom from worry. We need the training, the manual dexterity and industrial intelligence, which can be best given in a good agricultural, or building, or textile, or watch-making, or engraving, or mechanical school. It should be one of our prime objects to put the mechanic, the wage-worker who works with his hands, and who ought to work in a constantly larger degree with his head, on a higher plane of efficiency and reward, so as to increase his effectiveness in the economic world, and therefore the dignity, the remuneration, and the power of his position in the social world. To train boys and girls in merely literary accomplishments to the total exclusion of industrial, manual, and technical training, tends to unfit them for industrial work; and in real life most work is industrial.

The problem of furnishing well-trained craftsmen, or rather journeymen fitted in the end to become such, is not simple—few problems are simple in the actual process of their solution—and much care and forethought and practical common-sense

will be needed, in order to work it out in a fairly satisfactory manner. It should appeal to all our citizens. I am glad that societies have already been formed to promote industrial education, and that their membership includes manufacturers and leaders of labor unions, educators and publicists, men of all conditions who are interested in education and in industry. It is such co-operation that offers most hope for a satisfactory solution of the question as to what is the best form of industrial school, as to the means by which it may be articulated with the public-school system, and as to the way to secure for the boys trained therein the opportunity to acquire in the industries the practical skill which alone can make them finished journeymen.

There is but one person whose welfare is as vital to the welfare of the whole country as is that of the wage-worker who does manual labor; and that is the tiller of the soil—the farmer. If there is one lesson taught by history it is that the permamanent greatness of any State must ultimately depend more upon the character of its country population than upon anything else. No growth of cities, no growth of wealth can make up for a loss in either the number or the character of the farming population. In the United States more than in almost any other country we should realize this and should prize our country population. When this Nation began its independent existence it was as a nation of farmers. The towns were small and

were for the most part mere seacoast trading and fishing ports. The chief industry of the country was agriculture, and the ordinary citizen was in some way connected with it. In every great crisis of the past a peculiar dependence has had to be placed upon the farming population; and this dependence has hitherto been justified. But it can not be justified in the future if agriculture is permitted to sink in the scale as compared with other employments. We can not afford to lose that preeminently typical American, the farmer who owns his own farm.

Yet it would be idle to deny that in the last half century there has been in the eastern half of our country a falling off in the relative condition of the tillers of the soil, although signs are multiplying that the Nation has waked up to the danger and is preparing to grapple effectively with it. East of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio and the Potomac there has been on the whole an actual shrinkage in the number of the farming population since the Civil War. In the States of this section there has been a growth of population—in some an enormous growth—but the growth has taken place in the cities, and especially in the larger cities. This has been due to certain economic factors, such as the extension of railroads, the development of machinery, and the openings for industrial success afforded by the unprecedented growth of cities. The increased facility of communication has resulted in the withdrawal from rural communities of most

of the small, widely distributed manufacturing and commercial operations of former times, and the substitution therefor of the centralized commercial and manufacturing industries of the cities.

The chief offset to the various tendencies which have told against the farm has hitherto come in the rise of the physical sciences and their application to agricultural practices or to the rendering of country conditions more easy and pleasant. But these countervailing forces are as yet in their infancy. As compared with a few decades ago, the social or community life of country people in the east compares less well than it formerly did with that of the dwellers in cities. Many country communities have lost their social coherence, their sense of community interest. In such communities the country church, for instance, has gone backward both as a social and a religious factor. Now, we can not too strongly insist upon the fact that it is quite as unfortunate to have any social as any economic falling off. It would be a calamity to have our farms occupied by a lower type of people than the hard-working, self-respecting, independent, and essentially manly and womanly men and women who have hitherto constituted the most typically American, and on the whole the most valuable, element in our entire Nation. Ambitious native-born young men and women who now tend away from the farm must be brought back to it, and therefore they must have social as well as economic opportunities. Everything should be done to encourage the

growth in the open farming country of such institutional and social movements as will meet the demand of the best type of farmers. There should be libraries, assembly halls, social organizations of all kinds. The school building and the teacher in the school building should, throughout the country districts, be of the very highest type, able to fit the boys and girls not merely to live in, but thoroughly to enjoy and to make the most, of the country. The country church must be revived. All kinds of agencies, from rural free delivery to the bicycle and the telephone, should be utilized to the utmost; good roads should be favored; everything should be done to make it easier for the farmer to lead the most active and effective intellectual, political, and economic life.

There are regions of large extent where all this, or most of this, has already been realized; and while this is perhaps especially true of great tracts of farming country west of the Mississippi, with some of which I have a fairly intimate personal knowledge, it is no less true of other great tracts of country east of the Mississippi. In these regions the church and the school flourish as never before; there is a more successful and more varied farming industry; the social advantages and opportunities are greater than ever before; life is fuller, happier, more useful; and though the work is more effective than ever, and in a way quite as hard, it is carried on so as to give more scope for well-used leisure. My plea is that we shall all try to make

more nearly universal the conditions that now obtain in the most favored localities.

Nothing in the way of scientific work can ever take the place of business management on a farm. We ought all of us to teach ourselves as much as possible; but we can also all of us learn from others; and the farmer can best learn how to manage his farm even better than he now does by practice, under intelligent supervision, on his own soil in such way as to increase his income. This is the kind of teaching which has been carried on in Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas by Doctor Knapp, of the National Department of Agriculture. But much has been accomplished by the growth of what is broadly designated as agricultural science. This has been developed with remarkable rapidity during the last quarter of a century, and the benefit to agriculture has been great. As was inevitable, there was much error and much repetition of work in the early application of money to the needs of agricultural colleges and experiment stations alike by the Nation and the several States. Much has been accomplished; but much more can be accomplished in the future. The prime need must always be for real research, resulting in scientific conclusions of proved soundness. Both the farmer and the legislature must beware of invariably demanding immediate returns from investments in research efforts. It is probably one of our faults as a nation that we are too impatient to wait a sufficient length of time to accomplish the best results; and in agriculture ef-

fective research often, although not always, involves slow and long-continued effort if the results are to be trustworthy. While applied science in agriculture as elsewhere must be judged largely from the standpoint of its actual return in dollars, yet the farmers, no more than any one else, can afford to ignore the large results that can be enjoyed because of broader knowledge. The farmer must prepare for using the knowledge that can be obtained through agricultural colleges by insisting upon a constantly more practical curriculum in the schools in which his children are taught. He must not lose his independence, his initiative, his rugged self-sufficiency; and yet he must learn to work in the heartiest co-operation with his fellows.

The corner-stones of our unexampled prosperity are, on the one hand, the production of raw material, and its manufacture and distribution on the other. These two great groups of subjects are represented in the National Government principally by the Departments of Agriculture and of Commerce and Labor. The production of raw material from the surface of the earth is the sphere in which the Department of Agriculture has hitherto achieved such notable results. Of all the executive departments there is no other, not even the Post-Office, which comes into more direct and beneficent contact with the daily life of the people than the Department of Agriculture, and none whose yield of practical benefits is greater in proportion to the public money expended.

But great as its services have been in the past, the Department of Agriculture has a still larger field of usefulness ahead. It has been dealing with growing crops. It must hereafter deal also with living men. Hitherto agricultural research, instruction, and agitation have been directed almost exclusively toward the production of wealth from the soil. It is time to adopt in addition a new point of view. Hereafter another great task before the National Department of Agriculture and the similar agencies of the various States must be to foster agriculture for its social results, or, in other words, to assist in bringing about the best kind of life on the farm for the sake of producing the best kind of men. The Government must recognize the far-reaching importance of the study and treatment of the problems of farm life alike from the social and the economic standpoints; and the Federal and State Departments of Agriculture should co-operate at every point.

The farm grows the raw material for the food and clothing of all our citizens; it supports directly almost half of them; and nearly half the children of the United States are born and brought up on farms. How can the life of the farm family be made less solitary, fuller of opportunity, freer from drudgery, more comfortable, happier, and more attractive? Such a result is most earnestly to be desired. How can life on the farm be kept on the highest level, and where it is not already on that level, be so improved, dignified, and brightened as

to awaken and keep alive the pride and loyalty of the farmer's boys and girls, of the farmer's wife, and of the farmer himself? How can a compelling desire to live on the farm be aroused in the children that are born on the farm? All these questions are of vital importance not only to the farmer, but to the whole Nation; and the Department of Agriculture must do its share in answering them.

The drift toward the city is largely determined by the superior social opportunities to be enjoyed there, by the greater vividness and movement of city life. Considered from the point of view of national efficiency, the problem of the farm is as much a problem of attractiveness as it is a problem of prosperity. It has ceased to be merely a problem of growing wheat and corn and cattle. The problem of production has not ceased to be fundamental, but it is no longer final; just as learning to read and write and cipher are fundamental, but are no longer the final ends of education. We hope ultimately to double the average yield of wheat and corn per acre; it will be a great achievement; but it is even more important to double the desirability, comfort, and standing of the farmer's life.

We must consider, then, not merely how to produce, but also how production affects the producer. In the past we have given but scant attention to the social side of farm life. We should study much more closely than has yet been done the social organization of the country, and inquire whether its institutions are now really as useful to the farmer

as they should be, or whether they should not be given a new direction and a new impulse, for no farmer's life should lie merely within the boundary of his farm. This study must be of the East and the West, the North and the South; for the needs vary from place to place.

First in importance, of course, comes the effort to secure the mastery of production. Great strides toward this end have already been taken over the larger part of the United States; much remains to be done, but much has been done; and the debt of the Nation to the various agencies of agricultural improvement for so great an advance is not to be overstated. But we can not halt here. The benefits of high social organization include such advantages as ease of communication, better educational facilities, increased comfort of living, and those opportunities for social and intellectual life and intercourse, of special value to the young people and to the women, which are as yet chiefly to be had in centres of population. All this must be brought within the reach of the farmers who live on the farms, of the men whose labor feeds and clothes the towns and cities.

Farmers must learn the vital need of co-operation with one another. Next to this comes co-operation with the Government, and the Government can best give its aid through associations of farmers rather than through the individual farmer; for there is no greater agricultural problem than that of delivering to the farmer the large body of agricultural

knowledge which has been accumulated by the National and State Governments and by the agricultural colleges and schools. Nowhere has the Government worked to better advantage than in the South, where the work done by the Department of Agriculture in connection with the cotton-growers of the southwestern States has been phenomenal in its value. The farmers in the region affected by the boll weevil, in the course of the efforts to fight it have succeeded in developing a most scientific husbandry, so that in many places the boll weevil became a blessing in disguise. Not only did the industry of farming become of very much greater economic value in its direct results, but it became immensely more interesting to thousands of families. The meetings at which the new subjects of interest were discussed grew to have a distinct social value, while with the farmers were joined the merchants and bankers of the neighborhood. It is needless to say that every such successful effort to organize the farmer gives a great stimulus to the admirable educational work which is being done in the Southern States, as elsewhere, to prepare young people for an agricultural life. It is greatly to be wished that the communities from whence these students are drawn and to which they either return or should return could be co-operatively organized; that is, that associations of farmers could be organized, primarily for business purposes, but also with social ends in view. This would mean that the returned students from the institutions of technical

learning would find their environment prepared to profit to the utmost by the improvements in technical methods which they had learned.

The people of our farming regions must be able to combine among themselves, as the most efficient means of protecting their industry from the highly organized interests which now surround them on every side. A vast field is open for work by co-operative associations of farmers in dealing with the relation of the farm to transportation and to the distribution and manufacture of raw materials. It is only through such combination that American farmers can develop to the full their economic and social power. Combination of this kind has, in Denmark, for instance, resulted in bringing the people back to the land, and has enabled the Danish peasant to compete in extraordinary fashion, not only at home but in foreign countries, with all rivals.

Agricultural colleges and farmers' institutes have done much in instruction and inspiration; they have stood for the nobility of labor and the necessity of keeping the muscles and the brain in training for industry. They have developed technical departments of high practical value. They seek to provide for the people on the farms an equipment so broad and thorough as to fit them for the highest requirements of our citizenship; so that they can establish and maintain country homes of the best type, and create and sustain a country civilization more than equal to that of the city. The men they

train must be able to meet the strongest business competition, at home or abroad, and they can do this only if they are trained not alone in the various lines of husbandry but in successful economic management. These colleges, like the State experiment stations, should carefully study and make known the needs of each section, and should try to provide remedies for what is wrong.

The education to be obtained in these colleges should create as intimate relationship as is possible between the theory of learning and the facts of actual life. Educational establishments should produce highly trained scholars, of course; but in a country like ours, where the educational establishments are so numerous, it is folly to think that their main purpose is to produce these highly trained scholars. Without in the least disparaging scholarship and learning—on the contrary, while giving hearty and ungrudging admiration and support to the comparatively few whose primary work should be creative scholarship—it must be remembered that the ordinary graduate of our colleges should be and must be primarily a man and not a scholar. Education should not confine itself to books. It must train executive power, and try to create that right public opinion which is the most potent factor in the proper solution of all political and social questions. Book-learning is very important, but it is by no means everything; and we shall never get the right idea of education until we definitely understand that a man may be well trained in book-learn-

ing and yet, in the proper sense of the word, and for all practical purposes, be utterly uneducated; while a man of comparatively little book-learning may, nevertheless, in essentials, have a good education.

It is true that agriculture in the United States has reached a very high level of prosperity; but we can not afford to disregard the signs which teach us that there are influences operating against the establishment or retention of our country life upon a really sound basis. The overextensive and wasteful cultivation of pioneer days must stop and give place to a more economical system. Not only the physical but the ethical needs of the people of the country districts must be considered. In our country life there must be social and intellectual advantages as well as a fair standard of physical comfort. There must be in the country, as in the town, a multiplication of movements for intellectual advancement and social betterment. We must try to raise the average of farm life, and we must also try to develop it so that it shall offer exceptional chances for the exceptional man.

Of course the essential things after all are those which concern all of us as men and women, no matter whether we live in the town or the country, and no matter what our occupations may be. The root problems are much the same for all of us, widely though they may differ in outward manifestation. The most important conditions that tell for happiness within the home are the same for

the town and the country; and the relations between employer and employee are not always satisfactory on the farm any more than in the factory. All over the country there is a constant complaint of paucity of farm labor. Without attempting to go into all the features of this question, I would like to point out that you can never get the right kind, the best kind, of labor if you offer employment only for a few months, for no man worth anything will permanently accept a system which leaves him in idleness for half the year. And most important of all, I want to say a special word on behalf of the one who is too often the very hardest worked laborer on the farm—the farmer's wife. Reform, like charity, while it should not end at home, should certainly begin there; and the man, whether he lives on a farm or in a town, who is anxious to see better social and economic conditions prevail through the country at large, should be exceedingly careful that they prevail first as regards his own womankind. I emphatically believe that for the great majority of women the really indispensable industry in which they should engage is the industry of the home. There are exceptions, of course; but exactly as the first duty of the normal man is the duty of being the home-maker, so the first duty of the normal woman is to be the home-keeper; and exactly as no other learning is as important for the average man as the learning which will teach him how to make his livelihood, so no other learning is as important

for the average woman as the learning which will make her a good housewife and mother. But this does not mean that she should be an overworked drudge. I have hearty sympathy with the movement to better the condition of the average tiller of the soil, of the average wage-worker, and I have an even heartier sympathy and applause for the movement which is to better the condition of their respective wives. There is plenty that is hard and rough and disagreeable in the necessary work of actual life; and under the best circumstances, and no matter how tender and considerate the husband, the wife will have at least her full share of work and worry and anxiety; but if the man is worth his salt he will try to take as much as possible of the burden off the shoulders of his helpmate. There is nothing Utopian in the movement; all that is necessary is to strive toward raising the average, both of men and women, to the level on which the highest type of family now stands among American farmers, among American skilled mechanics, among American citizens generally; for in all the world there is no better and healthier home life, no finer factory of individual character, nothing more representative of what is best and most characteristic in American life, than that which exists in the higher type of American family; and this higher type of family is to be found everywhere among us, and is the property of no special group of citizens.

The best crop is the crop of children; the best

products of the farm are the men and women raised thereon; and the most instructive and practical treatises on farming, necessary though they be, are no more necessary than the books which teach us our duty to our neighbor, and above all to the neighbor who is of our own household. You young men and women of the agricultural and industrial colleges and schools—and, for that matter, you who go to any college or school—must have some time for light reading; and there is some light reading quite as useful as heavy reading, provided of course that you do not read in a spirit of mere vacuity. Aside from the great classics, and thinking only of the many healthy and stimulating books of the day, it is easy to pick out many which can really serve as tracts, because they possess what many avowed tracts and treatises do not, the prime quality of being interesting. You will learn the root principles of self-help and helpfulness toward others from "Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch," just as much as from any formal treatise on charity; you will learn as much sound social and industrial doctrine from Octave Thanet's stories of farmers and wage-workers as from avowed sociological and economic studies; and I cordially recommend the first chapter of "Aunt Jane of Kentucky" for use as a tract in all families where the men folks tend to selfish or thoughtless or overbearing disregard of the rights of their womankind.

Do not misunderstand me. I have not the slightest sympathy with those hysterical and foolish crea-

tures who wish women to attain to easy lives by shirking their duties. I have as hearty a contempt for the woman who shirks her duty of bearing and rearing the children, of doing her full housewife's work, as I have for the man who is an idler, who shirks his duty of earning a living for himself and for his household, or who is selfish or brutal toward his wife and children. I believe in the happiness that comes from the performance of duty, not from the avoidance of duty. But I believe also in trying, each of us, as strength is given us, to bear one another's burdens; and this especially in our own homes. No outside training, no co-operation, no Government aid or direction can take the place of a strong and upright character; of goodness of heart combined with clearness of head, and that strength and toughness of fibre necessary to wring success from a rough workaday world. Nothing outside of home can take the place of home. The school is an invaluable adjunct to the home, but it is a wretched substitute for it. The family relation is the most fundamental, the most important of all relations. No leader in church or state, in science or art or industry, however great his achievement, does work which compares in importance with that of the father and the mother, "who are the first of sovereigns and the most divine of priests."

AT CONNELLSVILLE, PA., JUNE 1, 1907

I greet you all. Remember always that the character of the Nation ultimately depends upon the

characters of the individual citizens who make it up, and that you can tell fairly well whether a man is a good citizen by whether he is the kind of man who makes a good neighbor, a good friend. Above all, remember that your first duty in being a good neighbor is to be a good neighbor to those who are nearest to you—be a good neighbor to your own wife and children. I have mighty little use for the man who is always declaiming in favor of an eight-hour day for himself who does not think anything at all of having a sixteen-hour day for his wife. Give fair play all around; and remember that the woman needs fair play even more than the man. I believe in an eight-hour day for the man, but I want to see the man's wife given as good a show as the man.

AT THE GEORGIA STATE BUILDING, JAMESTOWN EXPOSITION, JUNE 10, 1907

I can not express how deeply touched I am at the action of the State of Georgia, my mother's State, the State from which I draw half the blood in my veins, in erecting as the Georgia State House at the Jamestown Exposition a replica of my grandfather's house at Roswell, Ga.; the house in which my mother passed her youth and where she was married to my father. It is an act of gracious courtesy and consideration which I very deeply appreciate; and through the Governor and other representatives of Georgia I desire from my heart to thank all her citizens. Georgia's history is

unique, for she alone among the original thirteen colonies and the subsequent new States added thereto, was founded with a consciously benevolent purpose, with the deliberate intent to benefit mankind by upbuilding a commonwealth along carefully planned lines of social, political, and religious liberty and justice. Oglethorpe, the founder of Georgia, was a true apostle of philanthropy and of equality of opportunity for all. His set purpose was to found a State the gates of which should be open to the oppressed of every land and creed, and closed to every form of political, religious, or industrial bondage or persecution. His colony welcomed alike those who fled from political or social tyranny, and those, whether Christian or Jew, who sought liberty for conscience' sake. It was a high and honorable beginning; and I am proud, indeed, of my Georgian ancestry, and of the fact that my grandfather's grandfather, Archibald Bulloch, was the first Governor, or as the title then went, President of the new State, when the Continental Congress, of which he was also a member, declared that the Thirteen States had become a new and independent nation. Since then Georgia has grown at a rate even more astounding than the rate of growth of the Nation as a whole; her sons have stood high in every field of activity, intellectual or physical; and rapid though her progress has been in the past, it bids fair to be even greater in the wonderful new century which has now fairly opened.

Perhaps the very fact that I am half Southern

and half Northern in blood, and that for many years I was brought into peculiarly close association with the life of the great West, makes it natural for me to feel with intensity the strong sense of kinship with every portion of our great common country, which should be the birthright of every true American. Since I have been President I have visited every State and Territory within the borders of the Union, save such as can only be reached by sea. I have traveled from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf. I have spoken at country fairs, to colleges, to commercial and business organizations, to associations of professional men, to labor organizations, to men of every creed and parentage. The thing that has struck me most has been the essential oneness, the essential unity, of our people.

In the fundamentals I have found American citizens to be just about the same everywhere. In whatever locality of the country we live, whatever our fortune or occupation in life, there exist just about the same essential good qualities and much the same shortcomings in any gathering of our citizens. Of course, each community has its especial temptations, its especial shortcomings; and if it is wise each community will try to cure itself rather than to cause heartburnings by railing at the shortcomings of a sister community. There is ample field for the reform energies of every one of us in his or her particular sphere of home and neighborhood activity.

Not only is all of this true as between one community and another, but it is just as true between one class of our citizens and another. Now and then we meet well-meaning people who have a genuine horror and dread of all rich men and think of them as being set apart by peculiar vice and iniquity. Now and then we meet equally well-meaning rich men who have an equally irrational dread of those whom they style "labor leaders." In each case I think the hostility is in large part due to a want of sympathy caused by complete ignorance of the men who arouse such distrust or anger. As a matter of fact, if we take a given number of men of large fortune and a like number of wage-workers, we find that in their essential human nature they are all alike. In each group we find men as wise and as foolish, as good and as bad as in the other group. Such being the case it is certainly well that, so far as possible, when the men of a given group, as a whole, act in a way that we deem contrary to the public interest, we should treat the action as a wrong to be remedied rather than as a wrong to be avenged. We ought not to tolerate wrong. It is a sign of weakness to do so, and in its ultimate effects weakness is often quite as bad as wickedness. But in putting a stop to the wrong we should, so far as possible, avoid getting into an attitude of vindictive hatred toward the wrong-doer. He may be morally to blame and it may be necessary to punish him; but, on the other hand, the wrong he has committed may simply be

due to the existing condition of things, to conditions under which he has been brought up; and in such a case, while we must apply the remedy, and see that there is no further chance of harm to the community, it is neither just nor farsighted to exact revenge for what has been done. In short, friends, let us realize that in very truth we are knit together in ties of brotherhood, and that while it is proper and necessary that we should insist upon our rights, we should yet be patient and considerate in bearing with one another, and in trying, so far as in us lies, each to look at the problems that face us from his brother's standpoint as well as from his own.

During the last quarter of a century this Nation has made astounding strides in material progress, and in no other section has this progress been more noteworthy than in the South. While her agriculture has grown faster than ever before, there has also been a new growth of her manufacturing industries—indeed, there has been growth of every kind. But of course there is ample room for further growth. The South will be all the better for new immigrants of the right type, and I hope to see steamship lines carrying such immigrants established at ports like Savannah and Charleston, just as I hope to see ports like New Orleans connected by lines of steamers with the South American continent, the continent with which our relations should grow ever closer and mutually more advantageous. In the South, as everywhere through

the Union, we need to see a good education given free to all children, no matter what may be their race or color. Nor can we wisely permit this education to be of a merely literary type. More and more we are growing to realize that there must be an education of the hand as well as of the head. There must be agricultural and industrial colleges, and, above all, schools in which there can be elementary preparation for agriculture and industry. These schools for technical training will hold a great place in the future in fitting our citizens for doing their economic duties in the best possible shape. In the South there is a population peculiarly fitted to profit by them, a population which has been generally referred to as "poor white," a population of splendid capacities, and almost purely of the old native stock, which simply lacks the opportunity to develop a degree of industrial efficiency unsurpassed elsewhere on this continent.

It is a matter for congratulation that there is such a steady increase of interest in the Southern States in everything pertaining to children. This has already markedly shown itself, and I hope will still more markedly show itself in the future, in warring against the evil of child labor in factories. The factory is a very poor place indeed for a child; indeed, personally I think the factory a poor place for a woman—certainly for a married woman, or for an unmarried woman for more than a very few years. In any community organized on really healthy lines the average woman will have quite

enough to do in her own home, whether she is rich or poor; and nowhere else can she do work of such value to the Nation as a whole—and by work, I mean her housework, her work as housewife and mother, and not so-called "home industries." As regards children, it is as essential to look after their physical as their mental training. We can not afford to let children grow up ignorant; and if they are sent to school they can not, while young, also work hard outside without detriment, physical, mental, and moral. There is urgent need for the health authorities to increase their care over the hygienic conditions and surroundings of children of tender years, and especially to supervise those in the schools. It is a good thing to try to reform bad children, to try to build up degenerate children; but it is an even better thing to try to keep healthy in soul, body, and mind those children who are now sound, but who may easily grow up unsound if no care is taken of them. The Nation's most valuable asset is the children; for the children are the Nation of the future. All people alive to the Nation's need should join together to work for the moral, spiritual, and physical welfare of the children in all parts of our land. I am glad that there has been founded a national society of public school hygiene, and I wish it, and all its branches, well in every way.

There is increasing need that the welfare of the children should be effectively safeguarded by governmental action; with the proviso, however, that this action shall be taken with knowledge and in a

spirit of robust common-sense; for philanthropy, whether governmental or individual, is a curse and not a blessing when marked by a spirit of foolish sentimentality and ignorance. Such governmental action is merely one inevitable result of the ever-increasing growth of our complex industrialism. Decade by decade, it becomes more and more necessary that, without sacrificing their individual independence, the people of this country shall recognize in more effective form their mutual interdependence, and the duty of safeguarding the interest of each in the ultimate interest of all. We have inherited and developed a superbly self-reliant individualism in this country. I most earnestly hope that it will not be lost, that it will never be exchanged for a deadening socialism. The only permanently beneficial way in which to help any one is to help him to help himself; if either private charity, or governmental action, or any form of social expression destroys the individual's power of self-help, the gravest possible wrong is really done to the individual. Nevertheless, as the conditions of life grow more complex, it is not possible to trust our welfare only to the unbridled individual initiative of each unit of our population working as that unit wills. We need laws for the care of our children which were not needed when this country was in its infancy. We need laws for the control of vast corporations such as were not needed when the individual fortunes were far smaller than at present, and when these fortunes were not combined

for business use. In the same way we need to change our attitude toward labor problems from what that attitude was in the days when the great bulk of our people lived in the country with no more complex labor relations than is implied in the connection between the farmer and the hired help.

For example, the great increase in mechanical and manufacturing operations means a corresponding increase in the number of accidents to the wage-workers employed therein, these including both preventable and inevitable accidents. To the ordinary wage-worker's family such a calamity means grim hardship. As the work is done for the employer, and therefore ultimately for the public, it is a bitter injustice that it should be the wage-worker himself and his wife and children who bear the whole penalty. Legislation should be had, alike from the Nation and from the States, not only to guard against the needless multiplication of these accidents, but to relieve the financial suffering due to them. Last winter Congress passed a safety-appliance law which marked a long stride in the right direction. But there should be additional legislation to secure pecuniary compensation to workmen suffering from accidents, and when they are killed, to their families. At present both in the sphere covered by National legislation, and in the sphere covered by State legislation, the law in too many cases leaves the financial burden of industrial accidents to be borne by the injured workmen and their families; and a workman who suffers from an ac-

cident either has no case at all for redress or else must undertake a suit for damages against his employer. The present practice is based on the view announced nearly seventy years ago that "principles of justice and good sense demand that a workman shall take upon himself all the ordinary risks of his occupation." In my view, principles of justice and good sense demand the very reverse of this view, which experience has proved to be unsound and productive of widespread suffering. It is neither just, expedient, nor humane, it is revolting to judgment and sentiment alike, that the financial burden of accidents occurring because of the necessary exigencies of their daily occupation should be thrust upon those sufferers who are least able to bear it, and that such remedy as is theirs should only be obtained by litigation which now burdens our courts.

As a matter of fact there is no sound economic reason for distinction between accidents caused by negligence and those which are unavoidable, and the law should be such that the payment of those accidents will become automatic instead of being a matter for a lawsuit. Workmen should receive a certain definite and limited compensation for all accidents in industry, irrespective of negligence. When the employer, the agent of the public, on his own responsibility and for his own profit, in the business of serving the public, starts in motion agencies which create risks for others, he should take all the ordinary and extraordinary risks involved; and

though the burden will at the moment be his, it will ultimately be assumed, as it ought to be, by the general public. Only in this way can the shock of the accident be diffused, for it will be transferred from employer to consumer, for whose benefit all industries are carried on. From every standpoint the change would be a benefit. The community at large should share the burden as well as the benefits of industry. Employers would thereby gain a desirable certainty of obligation and get rid of litigation to determine it. The workman and the workman's family would be relieved from a crushing load.

The National Government should be a model employer. It should demand the highest quality of service from its employees and should care for them properly in return. Congress should adopt legislation providing limited but definite compensation for accidents to all workmen within the scope of the Federal power, including employees in navy-yards and arsenals. Similar legislation should follow throughout the States. The old and inadequate remedy of suit for negligence would then gradually disappear.

Such a policy would mean that with increased responsibility of the employer would come increased care, and accidents would be reduced in number. The temporary burden involved will not hamper our industries. Long experience of compensation laws in other countries has demonstrated their benefit. What we advocate is only a simple measure of justice, only one step toward the goal of securing,

so far as human wisdom can secure, fair and equitable treatment for each and every one of our people.

As a corollary to the above let me point out the extreme unwisdom of the railway companies in fighting the constitutionality of the national employers' liability law. No law is more emphatically needed, and it must be kept on the statute books in drastic and thoroughgoing form. The railroads are prompt to demand the interference and to claim the protection of the Federal courts in times of riot and disorder; and in turn the Federal Government should see to it that they are not permitted successfully to plead that they are under the Federal law when thereby their own rights can be protected, but outside of it when it is invoked against them in behalf of the rights of others. If it is proper for the Federal courts to issue injunctions in behalf of railroads, it is proper that railroads should be held to a strict liability for accidents occurring to their employees. There should be the plainest and most unequivocal additional statement, by enactment of Congress, to the effect that railroad employees are entitled to receive damages for any accident that comes to them as an incident of the performance of their duties, and the law should be such that it will be impossible for the railroads successfully to fight it without thereby forfeiting all right to the protection of the Federal Government under any circumstances. In the same way there should be rigid Federal legislation to minimize all railway accidents.

In closing, friends and fellow-citizens of Georgia, let me say one word suggested by the recent ceremonies, in which you have just taken part, in connection with your gift to the noble battleship named after your State. Our battleships and great armored cruisers, our fighting craft, are named after the States of our Union, and this symbolizes the fact that the Navy is a common possession of all of us, and that its honor and its triumphs are as dear to the heart of a true American who dwells anywhere inland as to a true American who dwells anywhere on the seacoast. The Navy is our surest guaranty for peace, and if war should ever come it will be the greatest safeguard for our honor and our interests. As is likewise true of our Army, it is manned by a volunteer force; for it must never be forgotten that all our soldiers and sailors, whether regular or not, are volunteers. Every encouragement should be given to our Navy, and no public servant should be pardoned for failing to do everything in him to see that we have the best type of ships and of guns, and that the officers and enlisted men are held to the strictest accountability for so practicing with the ships and guns that no navy afloat shall, ship for ship, squadron for squadron, be our superior. If the officers and enlisted men do their duty—and I am thankful to say that in our Navy the cases where they do not do their duty are relatively few in number—they put us all under a deep obligation to them, and we should give them all the reward and encouragement in our

power. The higher a man is in the service, the greater should be our insistence upon having the best kind of man. We should have a system of promotion either by elimination or by selection, so that mediocre officers could not come to the top. The officers in responsible positions should be watched with peculiar care. Each captain of a ship must do his duty just as emphatically as the enlisted men must do their duty, and the way they do their duty will largely depend upon the way he does his. He must keep his officers and men in good order, and he must remember that it is ordinarily his fault if they go down hill, if they deteriorate in discipline or become discontented. Modern wars are in reality decided long before they are fought. I earnestly hope that we shall never have another war; but if we do, its result will have been determined in advance; for its outcome will mainly depend upon the preparation which has been made to meet it in time of peace.

This lesson of preparedness does not relate merely to war; it is just as true of our ordinary civic affairs. It is as true of the nation as of the individual. Each of us does any given piece of work well or ill, largely according to how he has previously trained himself to do it. The nation, which is but the aggregate of the individuals composing it, will rise or fail to rise in any great crisis according to the ideals and standards that it has kept in mind in ordinary days, and according to the way in which it has practically trained itself to realize these ideals

and come up to these standards. We must insist upon justice and fair dealing as between man and man. We must strive each of us to treat his fellow with an eye single to what his conduct warrants. We must work hard and bear ourselves cheerfully and valiantly. We must be kindly and considerate, and yet show that at need we have iron in our blood. If we live our ordinary everyday lives after this fashion, we need have no fear that the priceless gift of free government will wither in our hands.

BEFORE THE NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AT JAMESTOWN, VA., JUNE 10, 1907

It is of course a mere truism to say that no other body of our countrymen wield as extensive an influence as those who write for the daily press and for the periodicals. It is also a truism to say that such power implies the gravest responsibility, and the man exercising it should hold himself accountable, and should be held by others accountable, precisely as if he occupied any other position of public trust. I do not intend to dwell upon your duties to-day, however, save that I shall permit myself to point out one matter where it seems to me that the need of our people is vital. It is essential that the man in public life and the man who writes in the public press shall both of them, if they are really good servants of the people, be prompt to assail wrong-doing and wickedness. But in thus assailing wrong-doing and wickedness, there are

two conditions to be fulfilled, because if unfulfilled, harm and not good will result. In the first place, be sure of your facts and avoid everything like hysteria or exaggeration; for to assail a decent man for something of which he is innocent is to give aid and comfort to every scoundrel, while indulgence in hysterical exaggeration serves to weaken, not strengthen, the statement of truth. In the second place, be sure that you base your judgment on conduct and not on the social or economic position of the individual with whom you are dealing. There are good and bad men in every walk of life, and their being good or bad does not depend upon whether they have or do not have large bank accounts. Yet this elemental fact, this fact which we all accept as self-evident, when we think each of us of the people whom he himself knows in his business and social relations, is often completely ignored by certain public men and certain public writers. The men who thus ignore it and who attack wickedness only when found in a particular class are always unsafe, and are sometimes very dangerous, leaders. Distrust equally the man who is never able to discover any vices of rich men to attack and the man who confines himself to attacking the sins and shortcomings of rich men. It is a sure sign of moral and mental dishonesty in any man if in his public assaults upon iniquity he is never able to see any iniquity save that of a particular class; and this whether he is able only to see the crimes of arrogance and oppression in the

rich or the crimes of envy and violence in the poor. He is no true American if he is a respecter of persons where right and wrong are concerned and if he fails to denounce the demagogue no less than the corruptionist, to denounce alike crimes of organized greed and crimes of brutal violence. There is equal need to denounce the wealthy man who swindles investors or buys legislatures or oppresses wage-workers, and the needy man who inflames class hatred or incites mob violence. We need to hold the scales of justice even, and to weigh them down on one side is as bad as to weigh them down on the other.

So much for what I have to say to you in your capacity of molders and guides of public thought. In addition I want to speak to you on two great movements in our public life which I feel must necessarily occupy no inconsiderable part of the time of our public men in the near future. One of these is the question of, in certain ways, reshaping our system of taxation so as to make it bear most heavily on those most capable of supporting the strain. The other is the question of utilizing the natural resources of the Nation in the way that will be of most benefit to the Nation as a whole.

In utilizing and conserving the natural resources of the Nation, the one characteristic more essential than any other is foresight. Unfortunately, foresight is not usually characteristic of a young and vigorous people, and it is obviously not a marked characteristic of us in the United States. Yet as-

surely it should be the growing nation with a future which takes the long look ahead; and no other nation is growing so rapidly as ours or has a future so full of promise. No other nation enjoys so wonderful a measure of present prosperity which can of right be treated as an earnest of future success, and for no other are the rewards of foresight so great, so certain, and so easily foretold. Yet hitherto as a Nation we have tended to live with an eye single to the present, and have permitted the reckless waste and destruction of much of our natural wealth.

The conservation of our natural resources and their proper use constitute the fundamental problem which underlies almost every other problem of our national life. Unless we maintain an adequate material basis for our civilization, we can not maintain the institutions in which we take so great and so just a pride; and to waste and destroy our natural resources means to undermine this material basis. During the last five years efforts have been made in several new directions in the Government service to get our people to look ahead, to exercise foresight, and to substitute a planned and orderly development of our resources in the place of a haphazard striving for immediate profit. The effort has been made through several agencies.

In 1902 the Reclamation Service began to develop the larger opportunities of the western half of our country for irrigation. The work includes all the States from the Great Plains through the

Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Slope. It has been conducted with the clear and definite purpose of using the valuable water resources of the public land for the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run; in other words, for the purpose of putting upon the land permanent home-makers who will use and develop it for themselves and for their children and children's children. There has been opposition, of course, to this work of the Reclamation Service; for we have been obliged to antagonize certain men whose interest it was to exhaust for their own temporary personal profit natural resources which ought to be developed through use, so as to be conserved for the permanent common advantage of the people as a whole. But there will be no halt in the work of preserving the waters which head in the Rocky Mountain region so as to make them of most use to the people as a whole; for the policy is essential to our national welfare.

The public lands of the United States should be utilized in similar fashion. Our present public land laws were passed when there was a vast surplus of vacant public land. The chief desire was to secure settlers thereon, and comparatively slight attention was paid as to exactly how the lands were disposed of in detail. In consequence, lax execution of the laws became the rule both in the land office and in the public mind, and land frauds were common and little noted. This was especially true when a system originally designed for the fertile and well-watered regions of the Middle West was

applied to the drier regions of the Great Plains and to the mountains and the Pacific Coast. In these regions the system lent itself to fraud, and much land passed out of the hands of the Government without passing into the hands of the home-maker. The Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice joined in prosecuting the offenders against the law; but both the law and its administration were defective and needed to be changed. Three years ago a Public Lands Commission was appointed to scrutinize the law and the facts and to recommend a remedy. Their examination specifically showed the existence of great frauds upon the public domain, and their recommendations for changes in the law were made with the design of conserving the natural resources of every part of the public land by putting it to its best use. Attention was especially called to the prevention of settlement by the passage of great areas of public lands into the hands of a few men, and to the enormous waste caused by unrestricted grazing on the open range; a system of using the natural forage on the public domain which amounts to putting a premium on its destruction. The recommendations of the Public Lands Commission were sound, for they were especially in the interest of the actual home-maker; and where the small home-maker could not utilize the land, it was provided that the Government should keep control of it so that it could not be monopolized by a few wealthy men. Congress has not yet acted upon

these recommendations, except for the repeal of the iniquitous lieu-land law. But the recommendations are so just and proper, so essential to our national welfare, that I believe they will surely ultimately be adopted.

In 1891 Congress authorized the President to create national forests in the public domain. These forest reserves remained for a long time in charge of the General Land Office, which had no men properly trained in forestry. But another department, that of Agriculture, possessed the trained men. In other words, the Government forests were without foresters and the Government foresters without forests. Waste of effort and waste of forests inevitably followed. Finally the situation was ended in 1905 by the creation of the United States Forest Service, which has stopped the waste, conserved the resources of the national forests, and made them useful; so that our forests are now being managed on a coherent plan, and in a way that augurs well for the future.

The mineral fuels of the eastern United States have already passed into the hands of large private owners, and those of the West are rapidly following. This should not be, for such mineral resources belong in a peculiar degree to the whole people. Under private control there is much waste from shortsighted methods of working, and the complete utilization is often sacrificed for a greater immediate profit. The mineral fuels under our present conditions are as essential to our prosper-

ity as the forests will always be. The difference is that the supply is definitely limited, for coal does not grow and trees do. It is obvious that the mineral fuels should be conserved, not wasted, and that enough of them should remain in the hands of the Government to protect the people against unjust or extortionate prices so far as that can still be done. What has been accomplished in the regulation of the great oil fields of the Indian Territory offers a striking example of the good results of such a policy. Last summer, accordingly, I withdrew most of the coal-bearing public lands temporarily from disposal, and asked for the legislation necessary to protect the public interest by the conservation of the mineral fuels; that is, for the power to keep the fee in the Government and to lease the coal, oil, and gas rights under proper regulation. No such legislation was passed, but I still hope that we shall ultimately get it.

In addition to treating aright for the benefit of the whole people the forests and the mineral beds, we should similarly try to preserve for the benefit of all the people the great stretches of public domain, some three hundred million acres in all, which are unfit for cultivation by present methods and valuable only for the forage which they supply. This vast area is now open to the free grazing of cattle, sheep, horses, and goats, without restriction or regulation. When population has increased, as is now the case, such utter lack of management means that the public domain is turned over to be

skinned by men whose only concern is to get what they can out of it at the moment, without any regard to whether or not it is ruined so far as the next generation is concerned. In other words, the range is not so much used as wasted by abuse; and as an incident conflict and bloodshed frequently arise between opposing users. With the rapid settling of the West the range is more and more overgrazed. Moreover, much of it can not be used to advantage unless it is fenced, for fencing is the only way by which to keep in check the absentee owners of nomad flocks which roam hither and thither, utterly destroying the pasturage and leaving a waste behind, so that their presence is incompatible with the presence of home-makers. Good judges estimate that our public range has now lost nearly half its value, yet fencing is against the law, and as the law now stands it is wellnigh impossible to do anything to keep the value of the range. The only practical remedy is to give control of the range to the Federal Government. Such control would not only stop all conflict but would conserve the forage without stopping its use, as our experience with the national forests has fully proved. It would likewise secure to the West the great benefits of legitimate fencing without interfering in the slightest with the settlement of the country—on the contrary, while promoting the settlement of the country. Hitherto, however, it has not proved possible to get any legislation to secure these ends. The destruction of the public range

will continue until, as a Nation, we insist upon the enactment of some such laws as those I have advocated.

For several years we have been doing everything in our power to prevent fraud upon the public land. What can be done under the present laws is now being done through the joint action of the Interior Department and the Department of Justice. But fully to accomplish the prevention of fraud there is need of further legislation, and especially of a sufficient appropriation to permit the Department of the Interior to examine certain classes of entries on the ground before they pass into private ownership. The appropriation asked for last winter, if granted, would have put an end to the squandering of the public domain, while it would have prevented any need of causing hardship to individual settlers by holding up their claims. However, the appropriation was not given us, and in consequence it is not possible to secure, as I would like to secure, the natural resources of the public land from fraud, waste, and encroachment.

So much for what we are trying to do in utilizing our public lands for the public; in securing the use of the water, the forage, the coal, and the timber for the public. In all four movements my chief adviser, and the man first to suggest to me the courses which have actually proved so beneficial, was Mr. Gifford Pinchot, the chief of the National Forest Service. Mr. Pinchot also suggested to me a movement supplementary to all of these move-

ments; one which will itself lead the way in the general movement which he represents and with which he is actively identified, for the conservation of all our natural resources. This was the appointment of the Inland Waterways Commission.

The inability of the railroads of the United States to meet the demands upon them has drawn public attention forcibly to the use of our waterways for transportation. But it is obvious that this is only one of their many uses, and that a planned and orderly development is impossible except by taking into account all the services they are capable of rendering. It was upon this ground that the Inland Waterways Commission was recently appointed. Their duty is to propose a comprehensive plan for the improvement and utilization of those great waterways which are the great potential highways of the country. Their duty is also to bring together the points of view of all users of streams, and to submit a general plan for the development and conservation of the vast natural resources of the waterways of the United States. Clearly it is impossible for the Waterways Commission to accomplish its great task without considering the relation of streams to the conservation and use of all other natural resources, and I have asked that it do so. Here, then, for the first time, the orderly development and planned conservative use of all our natural resources is presented as a single problem. One by one the individual tasks in this great problem have already been undertaken. One by

one in practical fashion the methods of dealing with them were worked out. National irrigation has proved itself a success by its actual working. Again, actual experience has shown that the national forests will fulfil the larger purpose for which they were created. All who have thoughtfully studied the subject have come to see that the solution of the public lands question lies with the home-maker, with the settler who lives on his land, and that Government control of the mineral fuels and the public grazing lands is necessary and inevitable. Each of these conclusions represented a movement of vast importance which would confer large benefits upon the Nation, but which stood by itself. They are connected together into one great fundamental problem—that of the conservation of all our natural resources. Upon the wise solution of this, much of our future obviously depends. Even such questions as the regulation of railway rates and the control of corporations are in reality subsidiary to the primal problem of the preservation in the interests of the whole people of the resources that nature has given us. If we fail to solve this problem, no skill in solving the others will in the end avail us very greatly.

Now as to the matter of taxation. Most great civilized countries have an income tax and an inheritance tax. In my judgment both should be part of our system of Federal taxation. I speak diffidently about the income tax because one scheme for an income tax was declared unconstitutional by

the Supreme Court by a five to four vote; and in addition it is a difficult tax to administer in its practical workings, and great care would have to be exercised to see that it was not evaded by the very man whom it is most desirable to have taxed, for if so evaded it would of course be worse than no tax at all, as the least desirable of all taxes is the tax which bears heavily upon the honest as compared with the dishonest man. Nevertheless, a graduated income tax of the proper type would be a desirable permanent feature of Federal taxation, and I still hope that one may be devised which the Supreme Court will declare constitutional.

In my judgment, however, the inheritance tax is both a far better method of taxation, and far more important for the purpose I have in view—the purpose of having the swollen fortunes of the country bear in proportion to their size a constantly increasing burden of taxation. These fortunes exist solely because of the protection given the owners by the public. They are a constant source of care and anxiety to the public, and it is eminently just that they should be forced to pay heavily for the protection given them. It is, of course, elementary that the Nation has the absolute right to decide as to the terms upon which any man shall receive a bequest or devise from another. We have repeatedly placed such laws on our own statute books, and they have repeatedly been declared constitutional by the courts. I believe that the tax should contain the progressive principle. Whatever any

individual receives, whether by gift, bequest, or devise, in life or in death, should, after a certain amount is reached, be increasingly burdened; and the rate of taxation should be increased in proportion to the remoteness of blood of the man receiving from the man giving or devising. The principle of this progressive taxation of inheritances has not only been authoritatively recognized by the legislation of Congress, but it is now unequivocally adopted in the leading civilized nations of the world—in, for instance, Great Britain, France, and Germany. Switzerland led off with the imposition of high progressive rates. Great Britain was the first of the great nations to follow suit, and within the last few years both France and Germany have adopted the principle. In Great Britain all estates worth five thousand dollars or less are practically exempt from death duties, while the increase is such that when an estate exceeds five millions of dollars in value and passes to a distant kinsman or stranger in blood, the Government receives nearly eighteen per cent. In France, under the progressive system, so much of an inheritance as exceeds ten millions of dollars pays over twenty per cent to the State if it passes to a distant relative, and five per cent if it passes to a direct heir. In Germany very small inheritances are exempt, but the tax is so sharply progressive that an inheritance not in agricultural or forest lands which exceeds two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, if it goes to distant relatives, is taxed at the rate of

about twenty-five per cent. The German law is of special interest, because it makes the inheritance tax an imperial measure, while allotting to the individual states of the Empire a portion of the proceeds and permitting them to impose taxes in addition to those imposed by the Imperial Government. In the United States the National Government has more than once imposed inheritance taxes in addition to those imposed by the States, and in the last instance about one-half of the States levied such taxes concurrently with the National Government, making a combined maximum rate in some cases as high as twenty-five per cent; and, as a matter of fact, several States adopted inheritance tax laws for the first time while the National law was still in force and unrepealed. The French law has one feature which is to be heartily commended. The progressive principle is so applied that each higher rate is imposed only on the excess above the amount subject to the next lower rate. This plan is peculiarly adapted to the working out of the theory of using the inheritance tax for the purpose of limiting the size of inheritable fortunes, since the progressive increase in the rates, according to this mode, may be carried to its logical conclusion in a maximum rate of nearly one hundred per cent for the amount in excess of a specified sum, without being confiscatory as to the rest of the inheritance; for each increase in rate would apply only to the amount above a certain maximum. I do not believe that any advantage comes either to

the country as a whole or to the individuals inheriting the money by permitting the transmission in their entirety of such enormous fortunes as have been accumulated in America. The tax could be made to bear more heavily upon persons residing out of the country than upon those residing within it. Such a heavy progressive tax is of course in no shape or way a tax on thrift or industry, for thrift and industry have ceased to possess any measurable importance in the acquisition of the swollen fortunes of which I speak long before the tax would in any way seriously affect them. Such a tax would be one of the methods by which we should try to preserve a measurable equality of opportunity for the people of the generation growing to manhood. As Lincoln pointed out, there are some respects in which men are obviously not equal; but there is no reason why there should not be an equality of self-respect and of mutual respect, an equality of rights before the law, and at least an approximate equality in the conditions under which each man obtains the chance to show the stuff that is in him when compared with his fellows.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. EDWARD B. CLARK

[*From Everybody's Magazine, June,* 1907]

I don't believe for a minute that some of these men who are writing nature stories and putting the word "truth" prominently in their prefaces know the heart of the wild things. Neither do I believe that

certain men who, while they may say nothing specifically about truth, do claim attention as realists because of their animal stories, have succeeded in learning the real secrets of the life of the wilderness. They don't know, or if they do know, they indulge in the wildest exaggeration under the mistaken notion that they are strengthening their stories.

As for the matter of giving these books to the children for the purpose of teaching them the facts of natural history—why, it's an outrage. If these stories were written as fables, published as fables, and put into the children's hands as fables, all would be well and good. As it is, they are read and believed because the writer not only says they are true, but lays stress upon his pledge. There is no more reason why the children of the country should be taught a false natural history than why they should be taught a false physical geography.

Dropping the matter of the school-books for a moment, take the stories of some of the nature writers who wish to be known as realists. Realism is truth. A writer like Stewart Edward White is true to nature; he knows the forest and the mountain and the desert; he puts down what he sees; and he sees the truth. But certain others either have not seen at all, or they have seen superficially. Nature-writing with them is no labor of love. Their readers, in the main persons who have never lived apart from the paved street, take the wildest flights of the imagination of these "realists" as an inspired word from the gospel of nature. It is false teaching.

Take the chapter from Jack London's "White Fang" that tells the story of a fight between the great northern wolf, White Fang, and a bulldog. Reading this, I can't believe that Mr. London knows much about the wolves, and I am certain that he knows nothing about their fighting, or as a realist he would not tell this tale. Here is a great wolf of the northern breed; its strength is such that with one stroke it can hamstring a horse or gut a steer, and yet it is represented as ripping and slashing with "long, tearing strokes" again and again and again a bulldog not much more than a third its size, and the bulldog, which should be in ribbons, keeps on fighting without having suffered any appreciable injury. This thing is the very sublimity of absurdity. In such a fight the chance for the dog would be only one in a thousand, its victory being possible only through getting a throat grip the instant that the fight started. This kind of realism is a closet product.

In the same book London describes a great dog-wolf being torn in pieces by a lucivee, a northern lynx. This is about as sensible as to describe a tom cat tearing in pieces a thirty-pound fighting bull terrier. Nobody who really knew anything about either a lynx or a wolf would write such nonsense. Now, I don't want to be misunderstood. If the stories of these writers were written in the spirit that inspired Mowgli and we were told tales like those of the animals at the Council Rock, of their deliberations and their something more than

human conclusions, we should know that we were getting the very essence of fable, and we should be content to read, enjoy, and accept them as fables. We don't in the least mind impossibilities in avowed fairy tales; and Bagheera and Baloo and Kaa are simply delightful variants of Prince Charming and Jack the Slayer of Giants. But when such fables are written by a make-believe realist, the matter assumes an entirely different complexion. Men who have visited the haunts of the wild beasts, who have seen them, and have learned at least something of their ways, resent such gross falsifying of nature's records.

William J. Long is perhaps the worst of these nature-writing offenders. It is his stories, I am told, that have been put, in part, into many of the public schools of the country in order that from them the children may get the truths of wild animal life.

Take Mr. Long's story of "Wayeeses, the White Wolf." Here is what the writer says in his preface to the story: "Every incident in this wolf's life, from his grasshopper hunting to the cunning caribou chase, and from the den in the rocks to the meeting of wolf and children on the storm-swept barrens, is minutely true to fact, and is based squarely upon my own observation and that of my Indians."

As a matter of fact, the story of Wayeeses is filled with the wildest improbabilities and a few

mathematical impossibilities. If Mr. Long wants us to believe his story of the killing of the caribou fawn by the wolf in the way that he says it was done, he must produce eye-witnesses and affidavits. I don't believe the thing occurred. Nothing except a shark or an alligator will attempt to kill by a bite behind the shoulder. There is no less vulnerable point of attack; an animal might be bitten there in a confused scuffle, of course, or seized in his jump so as to throw him; but no man who knows anything of the habits of wolves or even of fighting dogs would dream of describing this as the place to kill with one bite. I have seen scores of animals that have been killed by wolves; the killing or crippling bites were always in the throat, flank, or ham. Mr. George Shiras, who has seen not scores but hundreds of such carcasses, tells me that the death wounds or disabling wounds were invariably in the throat or the flank, except when the animal was first hamstrung.

If Mr. Long's wolf killed the caribou fawn by a bite through the heart, as the writer asserts, the wolf either turned a somersault—or pretty near it —or else got his head upside down under the fore legs of the fawn, a sufficiently difficult performance. Wayeeses would have to do this before he could get the whole breast of the animal in his mouth in order to crush it and bite through to the heart. It is very unlikely that any wolf outside of a book would be fool enough to attempt a thing like this even with a fawn caribou, when the kill-

ing could be done far more surely in so many easier ways.

But the absurdity of this story is as nothing to the story of the killing of a bull caribou by the same wolf, using the same method. "A terrific rush, a quick snap under the stag's chest just behind the fore legs where the heart lay; then the big wolf leaped aside and sat down quietly again to watch."

Mr. Long has Wayeeses, after tearing the caribou's heart, hold himself "with tremendous willpower from rushing in headlong and driving the game, which might run for miles if too hard pressed."

Now here Mr. Long is not thinking of anything he has ever seen, but has a confused memory of what he has heard or read of gut-wounded animals. A caribou with such a hurt may go on for a long distance before it drops, and it is wise not to follow it too closely, because if not followed it will often lie down, and in an hour or so will become too stiff to get up. But it would seem that even Mr. Long might know, what a child should know, that no caribou and no land mammal of any kind lives after the heart is pierced as he describes; whether followed or not, the caribou would fall in a few jumps. This, however, is the least of the absurdities of the story. That Wayeeses tore the heart of the bull caribou in the way that Mr. Long describes is a mathematical impossibility. The wolf's jaws would not gape right; the skin

and the chest walls with all the protective bone and tissue could not possibly be crushed in; the teeth of the wolf could not pierce through them to the heart, for no wolf's teeth are long enough for the job, nor are the teeth of any other carnivorous land mammal. By no possibility could a wolf or any other flesh-eating land mammal perform such a feat. It would need the tusks of a walrus. Mr. Long actually can not know the length of a wolf's fang; let him measure one, and then measure what the length would have to be to do the thing he describes; and then let him avow his story a pleasing fable. He will get a clear idea of just what the feat would be if he will hang a grapefruit in the middle of a keg of flour, and then see whether a big dog could bite through the keg into the grapefruit; it would be a parallel performance to the one he describes when he makes his picture-book wolf bite into the heart of a bull caribou.

As a sort of a climax of absurdity to this "true story of Wayeeses," Mr. Long draws a picture of this wilderness wolf, savage from tip to tip, doing for some lost children the kindly service of leading them home through the forest. Now let me repeat that this would be all right if the story were avowedly a fairy tale, like Kipling's "Jungle Book." But it is grotesque to claim literal truthfulness for such a tissue of absurdities.

I wonder sometimes as I read the lynx stories of Mr. Long if this wilderness tramper ever saw

a lynx to know it at all in any real sense. He has several stories of the lynx. They vary little in their grotesque inaccuracy. Take the story of "Upweekis the Shadow," which has place in a little book that I am told is used as one of the supplementary readers from which American school children are expected to get accurate knowledge of wilderness ways. There are all kinds of absurdities in this lynx "study." In one place, for instance, Mr. Long describes a number of lynxes gathered around the nearly eaten carcass of a caribou, while a menagerie of smaller beasts, including a pine marten, circulates freely among them. Now, of course, a marten would circulate among a company of lynxes just about as long as a mouse would circulate among a company of cats. But the most comic feature of Mr. Long's lynx article is his account of various desperate encounters he had with the animal, which he evidently regards as a monster dangerous to man.

We are told by the writer that a lone lynx made him exceedingly "uncomfortable" for half an afternoon. The animal "dogged" him hour after hour through the wilderness. He tells of making double time for four miles in order to reach camp before night should fall and give the lynx the advantage. Mr. Long declares that he had an encounter with the lynx before he succeeded in driving it from the trail. In reality, any one is in just as much danger of being attacked by a domestic cat when walking through his own garden as Mr. Long

was of being attacked by this lynx of the northern wilderness.

Once more let me say that if the fairy-tale mark were put on the stories of these writers, criticism would pass. Apparently, however, they wish to be known as teachers, or possibly they have a feeling of pride that springs from the belief that their readers will think of them as of those who have tramped the wilds and met nature in its gentleness and in its fierceness face to face.

Some of the writers who at times offend, at other times do excellent work. Mr. Thompson Seton has made interesting observations of fact, and much of his fiction has a real value. But he should make it clear that it *is* fiction, and not fact.

Many of the nature stories of Charles G. D. Roberts are avowedly fairy tales, and no one is deceived by them. When such is the case, we all owe a debt to Mr. Roberts, for he is a charming writer and he loves the wilderness. But even Mr. Roberts fails to consult possibilities in some of his stories.

The lynx seems to have an unholy fascination for these realists, and Mr. Roberts has succumbed to it. I wish he had learned a little of the real lynx, as distinguished from the Mr. Long lynx, before he wrote the story called "On the Night Trail."

It's a big lynx that weighs over forty pounds. A fifty-pound lynx is a giant among the American species. An ordinary lucivee is about the size of

a big Rocky Mountain bobcat. I have seen a light-weight dog, a cross between a bull terrier and a collie, take a full-grown, able-bodied lynx out of a hole, though this is a rather exceptional feat. When the lynx is hard pressed and gets into a good place it will turn and fight just as a domestic cat will fight in the same circumstances, but it won't fight on its own initiative. In a hole it can usually stand off a good dog, but in the open any big fighting dog will kill it. I have known two ordinary foxhounds to kill a lucivee; several times I have seen a Rocky Mountain lynx, or bobcat, killed by a pack of half a dozen or more hounds and terriers, and in no case did the struggle last over a few seconds, the lynx being killed so quickly that it had no time to leave a serious mark on any one of its numerous foes.

Now in this "Night-Trail" story of Mr. Roberts a man catches a lynx in a trap, ties it up, puts it into a bag, and, swinging it over his shoulder, starts through the woods with his burden. On his way the man is attacked by eight wolves that form themselves in a crescent at his front. He is armed with an axe and as well as he can he fights off his wolf assailants. In the crisis, in order to give the lynx a chance for its life and perhaps a chance to create "an effective diversion in his own favor," the man slashes the sack open, cuts the lynx's bonds, and sets it free.

The lynx, according to Mr. Roberts, goes into the fray with the wolves with a sort of savage

exultation. Several of the wolves receive slashes which send them yelping out of the battle. Now the thing is so utterly ridiculous that any man who knows both the wolf and the lynx loses patience. Real wolves would have made shreds of a real lynx within a twinkling of the time they closed in to the attack. The animal of the story would have stood no more chance with the eight wolves than a house cat would stand in a fight with eight bull terriers.

In one of the books that I understand is used as a supplementary reader is a story of "the caribou school." It is difficult to discuss this story with patience. The writer, Mr. Long, vouches for the truth of everything in the book by saying that the sketches are the result "of many years' personal observation in woods and fields." He tells of finding half a dozen mother caribou and nearly twice as many little ones gathered together in a natural opening surrounded by dense underbrush—and this was their schoolroom. Then there follows a description of the mother caribou's method of teaching manners to the young, of giving them lessons in jumping and of impressing upon them the necessity of following the leader. Mr. Long allows little for instinct. He says: "It was true kindergarten teaching, for under the guise of a frolic the calves were being taught a needful lesson." Such a tale, which the school children receive stamped with the word "truth," should need no comment; and it is rather startling to think of any school authorities accepting it.

The preservation of the useful and beautiful animal and bird life of the country depends largely upon creating in the young an interest in the life of the woods and fields. If the child mind is fed with stories that are false to nature, the children will go to the haunts of the animal only to meet with disappointment. The result will be disbelief, and the death of interest. The men who misinterpret nature and replace facts with fiction, undo the work of those who in the love of nature interpret it aright.

NATURE FAKERS

[*From Everybody's Magazine, September,* 1907]

In the Middle Ages there was no hard-and-fast line drawn between fact and fiction even in ordinary history; and until much later there was not even an effort to draw it in natural history. There are quaint little books on beasts, in German and in English, as late as the sixteenth century, in which the unicorn and the basilisk appear as real creatures; while to more commonplace animals there are ascribed traits and habits of such exceeding marvelousness that they ought to make the souls of the "nature fakers" of these degenerate days swell with envious admiration.

As real outdoor naturalists, real observers of nature, grew up, men who went into the wilderness to find out the truth, they naturally felt a half-indignant and half-amused contempt both for the men who invented preposterous fiction about wild

animals, and for the credulous stay-at-home people who accepted such fiction as fact. A century and a half ago old Samuel Hearne, the Hudson Bay explorer, a keen and trustworthy observer, while writing of the beaver, spoke as follows of the spiritual predecessors of certain modern writers:

"I can not refrain from smiling when I read the accounts of different authors who have written on the economy of these animals, as there seems to be a contest between them who shall most exceed in fiction. But the compiler of the 'Wonders of Nature and Art' seems, in my opinion, to have succeeded best in this respect; as he has not only collected all the fictions into which other writers on the subject have run, but has so greatly improved on them, that little remains to be added to his account of the beaver besides a vocabulary of their language, a code of their laws, and a sketch of their religion, to make it the most complete natural history of that animal which can possibly be offered to the public.

"There can not be a greater imposition, or indeed a grosser insult on common understanding, than the wish to make us believe the stories [in question] . . . a very moderate share of understanding is surely sufficient to guard [any one] against giving credit to such marvelous tales, however smoothly they may be told, or however boldly they may be asserted by the romancing traveler."

Hearne was himself a man who added greatly to the fund of knowledge about the beasts of the

wilderness. We need such observers; much remains to be told about the wolf and the bear, the lynx and the fisher, the moose and the caribou. Undoubtedly wild creatures sometimes show very unexpected traits, and individuals among them sometimes perform fairly startling feats or exhibit totally unlooked-for sides of their characters in their relations with one another and with man. We much need a full study and observation of all these animals, undertaken by observers capable of seeing, understanding, and recording what goes on in the wilderness; and such study and observation can not be made by men of dull mind and limited power of appreciation. The highest type of student of nature should be able to see keenly and write interestingly and should have an imagination that will enable him to interpret the facts. But he is not a student of nature at all who sees not keenly but falsely, who writes interestingly and untruthfully, and whose imagination is used not to interpret facts but to invent them.

We owe a real debt to the men who truthfully portray for us, with pen or pencil, any one of the many sides of outdoor life; whether they work as artists or as writers, whether they care for big beasts or small birds, for the homely farmland or for the vast, lonely, wilderness; whether they are scientists proper, or hunters of game, or lovers of all nature — which, indeed, scientists and hunters ought also to be. John Burroughs and John Muir, Stewart Edward White and Frederic Remington,

Olive Thorne Miller, Hart Merriam, William Hornaday, Frank Chapman, J. A. Allen, Ernest Ingersoll, Witmer Stone, William Cram, George Shiras, Caspar Whitney—to all of these, and to many like them whom I could name, we owe much, we who love the breath of the woods and the fields, and who care for the wild creatures, large or small. And the surest way to neutralize the work of these lovers of truth and nature, of truth in nature-study, is to encourage those whose work shows neither knowledge of nature nor love of truth.

The modern "nature faker" is of course an object of derision to every scientist worthy of the name, to every real lover of the wilderness, to every faunal naturalist, to every true hunter or nature lover. But it is evident that he completely deceives many good people who are wholly ignorant of wild life. Sometimes he draws on his own imagination for his fictions; sometimes he gets them second-hand from irresponsible guides or trappers or Indians.

In the wilderness, as elsewhere, there are some persons who do not regard the truth; and these are the very persons who most delight to fill credulous strangers with impossible stories of wild beasts. As for Indians, they live in a world of mysticism, and they often ascribe supernatural traits to the animals they know, just as the men of the Middle Ages, with almost the same childlike faith, credited the marvels told of the unicorn, the basilisk, the roc, and the cockatrice.

Of all these "nature fakers," the most reckless

and least responsible is Mr. Long; but there are others who run him close in the "yellow journalism of the woods," as John Burroughs has aptly called it. It would take a volume merely to catalogue the comic absurdities with which the books of these writers are filled. There is no need of discussing their theories; the point is that their alleged "facts" are not facts at all, but fancies. Their most striking stories are not merely distortions of facts, but pure inventions; and not only are they inventions, but they are inventions by men who know so little of the subject concerning which they write, and who to ignorance add such utter recklessness, that they are not even able to distinguish between what is possible, however wildly improbable, and mechanical impossibilities. Be it remembered that I am not speaking of ordinary mistakes, of ordinary errors of observation, of differences of interpretation and opinion; I am dealing only with deliberate invention, deliberate perversion of fact.

Now all this would be, if not entirely proper, at least far less objectionable, if the writers in question were content to appear in their proper garb, as is the case with the men who write fantastic fiction about wild animals for the Sunday issues of various daily newspapers. Moreover, as a writer of spirited animal fables, avowed to be such, any man can gain a distinct place of some importance. But it is astonishing that such very self-evident fiction as that which I am now discussing should,

when advertised as fact, impose upon any person of good sense, no matter how ignorant of natural history and of wild life. Most of us have enjoyed novels like "King Solomon's Mines," for instance. But if Mr. Rider Haggard had insisted that his novels were not novels but records of actual fact, we should feel a mild wonder at the worthy persons who accepted them as serious contributions to the study of African geography and ethnology.

It is not probable that the writers in question have even so much as seen some of the animals which they minutely describe. They certainly do not know the first thing about their habits, nor even about their physical structure. Judging from the internal evidence of their books, I should gravely doubt if they had ever seen a wild wolf or a wild lynx. The wolves and lynxes and other animals which they describe are full brothers of the wild beasts that appear in "Uncle Remus" and "Reynard the Fox," and deserve the same serious consideration from the zoological standpoint. Certain of their wolves appear as gifted with all the philosophy, the self-restraint, and the keen intelligence of, say, Marcus Aurelius, together with the lofty philanthropy of a modern altruist; though unfortunately they are hampered by a wholly erroneous view of caribou anatomy.

Like the White Queen in "Through the Looking-Glass," these writers can easily believe three impossible things before breakfast; and they do not mind

in the least if the impossibilities are mutually contradictory. Thus, one story relates how a wolf with one bite reaches the heart of a bull caribou, or a moose, or a horse—a feat which, of course, has been mechanically impossible of performance by any land carnivora since the death of the last sabre-toothed tiger. But the next story will cheerfully describe a doubtful contest between the wolf and a lynx or a bulldog, in which the latter survives twenty slashing bites. Now of course a wolf that could bite into the heart of a horse would swallow a bulldog or a lynx like a pill.

In one story a wolf is portrayed as guiding home some lost children, in a spirit of thoughtful kindness; let the overtrustful individual who has girded up his loins to believe this think of the way he would receive the statement of some small farmer's boy that when lost he was guided home by a coon, a possum, or a woodchuck. Again, one of these story-book wolves, when starving, catches a red squirrel, which he takes round as a present to propitiate a bigger wolf.* If any man seriously thinks

* This particular incident was alleged to have taken place in Newfoundland, the wolf being the same as the hero of the caribou-heart-bite episode. Mr. George Shiras had informed me that there were no red squirrels in Newfoundland, and that wolves were so scarce as to be practically non-existent, if they existed at all. He now writes me under date of July 19th as follows:

"I enclose a copy of a recent letter received from my guide —in Newfoundland—which shows that I did not err regarding the wolves and red squirrel.

"When Dr. Long alleges he was following, for weeks at a

a starving wolf would act in this manner, let him study hounds when feeding, even when they are not starving.

The animals are alternately portrayed as actuated by motives of exalted humanitarianism, and as possessed of demoniac prowess and insight into motive. In one story the fisher figures in the latter capacity. A fisher is a big marten, the size of a fox. This particular story-book fisher, when pursued by hunters on snow-shoes, kills a buck by a bite in the throat, and leaves the carcass as a bribe to the hunters, hoping thereby to distract attention from himself! Now, foxes are continually hunted; they are far more clever than fishers. What rational man would pay heed to a story that a fox when hunted killed a good-sized calf by a bite in the throat, and left it as a bribe to the hounds and hunters, to persuade them to leave him alone? One story is just as possible as the other.

In another story the salmon is the hero. The writer begins by blunders about the young salmon

time, wolves in Newfoundland, this animal was extinct, or practically so. Squires is one of the best and most reliable trappers on this island, being one of the few who permanently reside in the interior, trapping in the most northerly and wildest portions of the country, where wolf sign would be instantly detected were the animals to be found on this island. Such audacity on the part of Dr. Long is simply astounding."

The letter from the guide, W. T. Squires, runs in part as follows:

"There are no squirrel of any kind here. Neither have I seen any sign of wolf in the last ten years."

which a ten minutes' visit to any government fish hatchery would have enabled him to avoid; and as a climax describes how the salmon goes up a fall by flopping from ledge to ledge of a cliff, under circumstances which make the feat about as probable as that the fish would use a step-ladder. As soon as these writers get into the wilderness, they develop preternatural powers of observation, and, as Mr. Shiras says, become themselves "invisible and odorless," so that the shyest wild creatures permit any closeness of intimacy on their part; in one recent story about a beaver colony, the alternative to the above proposition is that the beavers were both blind and without sense of smell.

Yet these same writers, who see such marvelous things as soon as they go into the woods, are incapable of observing aright the most ordinary facts when at home. One of their stories relates how the eyes of frogs shine at night in the wilderness; the author apparently ignoring the fact that frog-ponds are common in less remote places, and are not inhabited by blazing-eyed frogs. Two of our most common and most readily observed small mammals are the red squirrel and the chipmunk. The chipmunk has cheek pouches, in which he stores berries, grain, and small nuts, whereas the red squirrel has no cheek pouches, and carries nuts between his teeth. Yet even this simple fact escapes the attention of one of the writers we are discussing, who endows a red squirrel with cheek pouches filled with

nuts. Evidently excessive indulgence in invention tends to atrophy the power of accurate observation.

In one story a woodcock is described as making a kind of mud splint for its broken leg; it seems a pity not to have added that it also made itself a crutch to use while the splint was on. A Baltimore oriole is described as making a contrivance of twigs and strings whereby to attach its nest, under circumstances which would imply the mental ability and physical address of a sailor making a hammock; and the story is backed up by affidavits, as are others of these stories. This particular feat is precisely as possible as that a Rocky Mountain pack rat can throw the diamond hitch. The affidavits in support of these various stories are interesting only because of the curious light they throw on the personalities of those making and believing them.

If the writers who make such startling discoveries in the wilderness would really study even the denizens of a barnyard, they would be saved from at least some of their more salient mistakes. Their stories dwell much on the "teaching" of the young animals by their elders and betters. In one story, for instance, a wild duck is described as "teaching" her young how to swim and get their food. If this writer had strolled into the nearest barnyard containing a hen which had hatched out ducklings, a glance at the actions of those ducklings when the hen happened to lead them near a puddle would

have enlightened him as to how much "teaching" they needed. But these writers exercise the same florid imagination when they deal with a robin or a rabbit as when they describe a bear, a moose, or a salmon.

It is half-amusing and half-exasperating to think that there should be excellent persons to whom it is necessary to explain that books stuffed with such stories, in which the stories are stated as facts, are preposterous in their worthlessness. These worthy persons vividly call to mind Professor Lounsbury's comment on "the infinite capacity of the human brain to withstand the introduction of knowledge." The books in question contain no statement which a serious and truth-loving student of nature can accept, save statements which have already long been known as established by trustworthy writers. The fables they contain bear the same relation to real natural history that Barnum's famous artificial mermaid bore to real fish and real mammals. No man who has really studied nature in a spirit of seeking the truth, whether he be big or little, can have any controversy with these writers; it would be as absurd as to expect some genuine student of anthropology or archæology to enter into a controversy with the clumsy fabricators of the Cardiff Giant. Their books carry their own refutation; and affidavits in support of the statements they contain are as worthless as the similar affidavits once solemnly issued to show that the Cardiff "giant" was a petrified pre-Adamite man. There is now no

more excuse for being deceived by their stories than for being still in doubt about the silly Cardiff hoax.

Men of this stamp will necessarily arise, from time to time, some in one walk of life, some in another. Our quarrel is not with these men, but with those who give them their chance. We who believe in the study of nature feel that a real knowledge and appreciation of wild things, of trees, flowers, birds, and of the grim and crafty creatures of the wilderness, give an added beauty and health to life. Therefore we abhor deliberate or reckless untruth in this study as much as in any other; and therefore we feel that a grave wrong is committed by all who, holding a position that entitles them to respect, yet condone and encourage such untruth.

AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNER-STONE OF THE PILGRIM MEMORIAL MONUMENT, PROVINCETOWN, MASS., AUGUST 20, 1907

It is not too much to say that the event commemorated by the monument which we have come here to dedicate was one of those rare events which can in good faith be called of world importance. The coming hither of the Pilgrim three centuries ago, followed in far larger numbers by his sterner kinsmen, the Puritans, shaped the destinies of this continent, and therefore profoundly affected the destiny of the whole world. Men of other races, the Frenchman and the Spaniard, the Dutchman,

the German, the Scotchman, the Irishman, and the Swede, made settlements within what is now the United States, during the colonial period of our history and before the Declaration of Independence; and since then there has been an ever-swelling immigration from Ireland and from the mainland of Europe; but it was the Englishman who settled in Virginia and the Englishman who settled in Massachusetts who did most in shaping the lines of our national development.

We can not as a Nation be too profoundly grateful for the fact that the Puritan has stamped his influence so deeply on our national life. We need have but scant patience with the men who now rail at the Puritan's faults. They were evident, of course, for it is a quality of strong natures that their failings, like their virtues, should stand out in bold relief; but there is nothing easier than to belittle the great men of the past by dwelling only on the points where they come short of the universally recognized standards of the present. Men must be judged with reference to the age in which they dwell, and the work they have to do. The Puritan's task was to conquer a continent; not merely to overrun it, but to settle it, to till it, to build upon it a high industrial and social life; and, while engaged in the rough work of taming the shaggy wilderness, at that very time also to lay deep the immovable foundations of our whole American system of civil, political, and religious liberty achieved through the orderly process of law. This was the

work allotted him to do; this is the work he did; and only a master spirit among men could have done it.

We have traveled far since his day. That liberty of conscience which he demanded for himself, we now realize must be as freely accorded to others as it is resolutely insisted upon for ourselves. The splendid qualities which he left to his children, we other Americans who are not of Puritan blood also claim as our heritage. You, sons of the Puritans, and we, who are descended from races whom the Puritans would have deemed alien—we are all Americans together. We all feel the same pride in the genesis, in the history, of our people; and therefore this shrine of Puritanism is one at which we all gather to pay homage, no matter from what country our ancestors sprang.

We have gained some things that the Puritan had not—we of this generation, we of the twentieth century, here in this great Republic; but we are also in danger of losing certain things which the Puritan had and which we can by no manner of means afford to lose. We have gained a joy of living which he had not, and which it is a good thing for every people to have and to develop. Let us see to it that we do not lose what is more important still; that we do not lose the Puritan's iron sense of duty, his unbending, unflinching will to do the right as it was given him to see the right. It is a good thing that life should gain in sweetness, but only provided that it does not lose in strength. Ease and rest and

pleasure are good things, but only if they come as the reward of work well done, of a good fight well won, of strong effort resolutely made and crowned by high achievement. The life of mere pleasure, of mere effortless ease, is as ignoble for a nation as for an individual. The man is but a poor father who teaches his sons that ease and pleasure should be their chief objects in life; the woman who is a mere petted toy, incapable of serious purpose, shrinking from effort and duty, is more pitiable than the veriest overworked drudge. So he is but a poor leader of the people, but a poor national adviser, who seeks to make the Nation in any way subordinate effort to ease, who would teach the people not to prize as the greatest blessing the chance to do any work, no matter how hard, if it becomes their duty to do it. To the sons of the Puritans it is almost needless to say that the lesson above all others which Puritanism can teach this Nation is the all-importance of the resolute performance of duty. If we are men we will pass by with contemptuous disdain alike the advisers who would seek to lead us into the paths of ignoble ease and those who would teach us to admire successful wrong-doing. Our ideals should be high, and yet they should be capable of achievement in practical fashion; and we are as little to be excused if we permit our ideals to be tainted with what is sordid and mean and base, as if we allow our power of achievement to atrophy and become either incapable of effort or capable only of such fantastic effort as to accomplish nothing

of permanent good. The true doctrine to preach to this Nation, as to the individuals composing this Nation, is not the life of ease, but the life of effort, If it were in my power to promise the people of this land anything, I would not promise them pleasure. I would promise them that stern happiness which comes from the sense of having done in practical fashion a difficult work which was worth doing.

The Puritan owed his extraordinary success in subduing this continent and making it the foundation for a social life of ordered liberty primarily to the fact that he combined in a very remarkable degree both the power of individual initiative, of individual self-help, and the power of acting in combination with his fellows; and that furthermore he joined to a high heart that shrewd common-sense which saves a man from the besetting sins of the visionary and the doctrinaire. He was stout hearted and hard headed. He had lofty purposes, but he had practical good sense, too. He could hold his own in the rough workaday world without clamorous insistence upon being helped by others, and yet he could combine with others whenever it became necessary to do a job which could not be as well done by any one man individually.

These were the qualities which enabled him to do his work, and they are the very qualities which we must show in doing our work to-day. There is no use in our coming here to pay homage to the men who founded this Nation unless we first of

all come in the spirit of trying to do our work to-day as they did their work in the yesterdays that have vanished. The problems shift from generation to generation, but the spirit in which they must be approached, if they are to be successfully solved, remains ever the same. The Puritan tamed the wilderness, and built up a free government on the stump-dotted clearings amid the primeval forest. His descendants must try to shape the life of our complex industrial civilization by new devices, by new methods, so as to achieve in the end the same results of justice and fair dealing toward all. He cast aside nothing old merely for the sake of innovation, yet he did not hesitate to adopt anything new that would serve his purpose. When he planted his commonwealths on this rugged coast he faced wholly new conditions and he had to devise new methods of meeting them. So we of to-day face wholly new conditions in our social and industrial life. We should certainly not adopt any new scheme for grappling with them merely because it is new and untried; but we can not afford to shrink from grappling with them because they can only be grappled with by some new scheme.

The Puritan was no Laodicean, no *laissez-faire* theorist. When he saw conduct which was in violation of his rights—of the rights of man, the rights of God, as he understood them—he attempted to regulate such conduct with instant, unquestioning promptness and effectiveness. If there was no other way to secure conformity with the rule of right,

then he smote down the transgressor with the iron of his wrath. The spirit of the Puritan was a spirit which never shrank from regulation of conduct if such regulation was necessary for the public weal; and this is the spirit which we must show to-day whenever it is necessary.

The utterly changed conditions of our national life necessitate changes in certain of our laws, of our governmental methods. Our federal system of government is based upon the theory of leaving to each community, to each State, the control over those things which affect only its own members and which the people of the locality themselves can best grapple with, while providing for national regulation in those matters which necessarily affect the Nation as a whole. It seems to me that such questions as national sovereignty and State's rights need to be treated not empirically or academically, but from the standpoint of the interests of the people as a whole. National sovereignty is to be upheld in so far as it means the sovereignty of the people used for the real and ultimate good of the people; and State's rights are to be upheld in so far as they mean the people's rights. Especially is this true in dealing with the relations of the people as a whole to the great corporations which are the distinguishing feature of modern business conditions.

Experience has shown that it is necessary to exercise a far more efficient control than at present over the business use of those vast fortunes, chiefly corporate, which are used (as under modern con-

ditions they almost invariably are) in interstate business. When the Constitution was created none of the conditions of modern business existed. They are wholly new and we must create new agencies to deal effectively with them. There is no objection in the minds of this people to any man's earning any amount of money if he does it honestly and fairly, if he gets it as the result of special skill and enterprise, as a reward of ample service actually rendered. But there is a growing determination that no man shall amass a great fortune by special privilege, by chicanery and wrong-doing, so far as it is in the power of legislation to prevent; and that a fortune, however amassed, shall not have a business use that is antisocial. Most large corporations do a business that is not confined to any one State. Experience has shown that the effort to control these corporations by mere State action can not produce wholesome results. In most cases such effort fails to correct the real abuses of which the corporation is or may be guilty; while in other cases the effort is apt to cause either hardship to the corporation itself or else hardship to neighboring States which have not tried to grapple with the problem in the same manner; and of course we must be as scrupulous to safeguard the rights of the corporations as to exact from them in return a full measure of justice to the public. I believe in a national incorporation law for corporations engaged in interstate business. I believe, furthermore, that the need for action is most pressing as regards

those corporations which, because they are common carriers, exercise a quasi-public function; and which can be completely controlled in all respects by the Federal Government by the exercise of the power conferred under the interstate commerce clause, and, if necessary, under the post-road clause, of the Constitution. During the last few years we have taken marked strides in advance along the road of proper regulation of these railroad corporations; but we must not stop in the work. The National Government should exercise over them a similar supervision and control to that which is exercised over national banks. We can do this only by proceeding farther along the lines marked out by the recent national legislation.

In dealing with any totally new set of conditions there must at the outset be hesitation and experiment. Such has been our experience in dealing with the enormous concentration of capital employed in interstate business. Not only the legislatures but the courts and the people need gradually to be educated so that they may see what the real wrongs are and what the real remedies. Almost every big business concern is engaged in interstate commerce, and such a concern must not be allowed by a dexterous shifting of position, as has been too often the case in the past, to escape thereby all responsibility either to State or Nation. The American people became firmly convinced of the need of control over these great aggregations of capital, especially where they had a monopolistic tendency,

before they became quite clear as to the proper way of achieving the control. Through their representatives in Congress they tried two remedies, which were to a large degree, at least as interpreted by the courts, contradictory. On the one hand, under the antitrust law the effort was made to prohibit all combination, whether it was or was not hurtful or beneficial to the public. On the other hand, through the interstate commerce law a beginning was made in exercising such supervision and control over combinations as to prevent their doing anything harmful to the body politic. The first law, the so-called Sherman law, has filled a useful place, for it bridges over the transition period until the American people shall definitely make up its mind that it will exercise over the great corporations that thoroughgoing and radical control which it is certain ultimately to find necessary. The principle of the Sherman law, so far as it prohibits combinations which, whether because of their extent or of their character, are harmful to the public, must always be preserved. Ultimately, and I hope with reasonable speed, the National Government must pass laws which, while increasing the supervisory and regulatory power of the Government, will also permit such useful combinations as are made with absolute openness and as the representatives of the Government may previously approve. But it will not be possible to permit such combinations save as the second stage in a course of proceedings of which the first stage must be the exercise

of a far more complete control by the National Government.

In dealing with those who offend against the antitrust and interstate commerce laws the Department of Justice has to encounter many and great difficulties. Often men who have been guilty of violating these laws have really acted in criminal fashion, and if possible should be proceeded against criminally; and therefore it is advisable that there should be a clause in these laws providing for such criminal action and for punishment by imprisonment as well as by fine. But, as is well known, in a criminal action the law is strictly construed in favor of the defendant, and in our country, at least, both judge and jury are far more inclined to consider his rights than they are the interests of the general public; while in addition it is always true that a man's general practices may be so bad that a civil action will lie when it may not be possible to convict him of any one criminal act. There are unfortunately a certain number of our fellow-countrymen who seem to accept the view that unless a man can be proved guilty of some particular crime he shall be counted a good citizen, no matter how infamous the life he has led, no matter how pernicious his doctrines or his practices. This is the view announced from time to time with clamorous insistence, now by a group of predatory capitalists, now by a group of sinister anarchistic leaders and agitators, whenever a special champion of either class, no matter how evil his general life, is acquitted

of some one specific crime. Such a view is wicked whether applied to capitalist or labor leader, to rich man or poor man. (And, by the way, I take this opportunity of stating that all that I have said in the past as to desirable and undesirable citizens remains true, and that I stand by it.)

We have to take this feeling into account when we are debating whether it is possible to get a conviction in a criminal proceeding against some rich trust magnate, many of whose actions are severely to be condemned from the moral and social standpoint, but no one of whose actions seems clearly to establish such technical guilt as will ensure a conviction. As a matter of expediency, in enforcing the law against a great corporation, we have continually to weigh the arguments pro and con as to whether a prosecution can successfully be entered into, and as to whether we can be successful in a criminal action against the chief individuals in the corporation, and if not, whether we can at least be successful in a civil action against the corporation itself. Any effective action on the part of the Government is always objected to, as a matter of course, by the wrong-doers, by the beneficiaries of the wrong-doers, and by their champions; and often one of the most effective ways of attacking the action of the Government is by objecting to practical action upon the ground that it does not go far enough. One of the favorite devices of those who are really striving to prevent the enforcement of these laws is to clamor for action of such severity

that it can not be undertaken because it will be certain to fail if tried. An instance of this is the demand often made for criminal prosecutions where such prosecutions would be certain to fail. We have found by actual experience that a jury which will gladly punish a corporation by fine, for instance, will acquit the individual members of that corporation if we proceed against them criminally because of those very things which the corporation which they direct and control has done. In a recent case against the Licorice Trust we indicted and tried the two corporations and their respective presidents. The contracts and other transactions establishing the guilt of the corporations were made through, and so far as they were in writing were signed by, the two presidents. Yet the jury convicted the two corporations and acquitted the two men. Both verdicts could not possibly have been correct; but apparently the average juryman wishes to see trusts broken up, and is quite ready to fine the corporation itself; but is very reluctant to find the facts "proven beyond a reasonable doubt" when it comes to sending to jail a reputable member of the business community for doing what the business community has unhappily grown to recognize as wellnigh normal in business. Moreover, under the necessary technicalities of criminal proceedings, often the only man who can be reached criminally will be some subordinate who is not the real guilty party at all.

Many men of large wealth have been guilty of

conduct which from the moral standpoint is criminal, and their misdeeds are to a peculiar degree reprehensible, because those committing them have no excuse of want, of poverty, of weakness and ignorance to offer as partial atonement. When in addition to moral responsibility these men have a legal responsibility which can be proved so as to impress a judge and jury, then the Department will strain every nerve to reach them criminally. Where this is impossible, then it will take whatever action will be most effective under the actual conditions.

In the last six years we have shown that there is no individual and no corporation so powerful that he or it stands above the possibility of punishment under the law. Our aim is to try to do something effective; our purpose is to stamp out the evil; we shall seek to find the most effective device for this purpose; and we shall then use it, whether the device can be found in existing law or must be supplied by legislation. Moreover, when we thus take action against the wealth which works iniquity, we are acting in the interest of every man of property who acts decently and fairly by his fellows; and we are strengthening the hands of those who propose fearlessly to defend property against all unjust attacks. No individual, no corporation, obeying the law has anything to fear from this Administration.

During the present trouble with the stock market I have, of course, received countless requests and suggestions, public and private, that I should say or do something to ease the situation. There is a

world-wide financial disturbance; it is felt in the bourses of Paris and Berlin; and British consols are lower than for a generation, while British railway securities have also depreciated. On the New York Stock Exchange the disturbance has been peculiarly severe. Most of it I believe to be due to matters not peculiar to the United States, and most of the remainder to matters wholly unconnected with any governmental action; but it may well be that the determination of the Government (in which, gentlemen, it will not waver) to punish certain malefactors of great wealth, has been responsible for something of the trouble; at least to the extent of having caused these men to combine to bring about as much financial stress as possible, in order to discredit the policy of the Government and thereby secure a reversal of that policy, so that they may enjoy unmolested the fruits of their own evil-doing. That they have misled many good people into believing that there should be such reversal of policy is possible. If so I am sorry; but it will not alter my attitude. Once for all let me say that so far as I am concerned, and for the eighteen months of my Presidency that remain, there will be no change in the policy we have steadily pursued, no let up in the effort to secure the honest observance of the law; for I regard this contest as one to determine who shall rule this free country—the people through their governmental agents, or a few ruthless and domineering men whose wealth makes them peculiarly formidable because they hide behind the

breastworks of corporate organization. I wish there to be no mistake on this point; it is idle to ask me not to prosecute criminals, rich or poor. But I desire no less emphatically to have it understood that we have sanctioned and will sanction no action of a vindictive type, and above all no action which shall inflict great and unmerited suffering upon innocent stockholders or upon the public as a whole. Our purpose is to act with the minimum of harshness compatible with attaining our ends. In the man of great wealth who has earned his wealth honestly and uses it wisely we recognize a good citizen of the best type, worthy of all praise and respect. Business can be done under modern conditions only through corporations, and our purpose is heartily to favor the corporations that do well. The Administration appreciates that liberal but honest profits for legitimate promoting, good salaries, ample salaries, for able and upright management, and generous dividends for capital employed either in founding or continuing wholesome business ventures, are the factors necessary for successful corporate activity and therefore for generally prosperous business conditions. All these are compatible with fair dealing as between man and man and rigid obedience to the law. Our aim is to help every honest man, every honest corporation, and our policy means in its ultimate analysis a healthy and prosperous expansion of the business activities of honest business men and honest corporations.

I very earnestly hope that the legislation which deals with the regulation of corporations engaged in interstate business will also deal with the rights and interests of the wage-workers employed by those corporations. Action was taken by the Congress last year limiting the number of hours that railway employees should be employed. The law is a good one; but if in practice it proves necessary to strengthen it, it must be strengthened. We have now secured a national employers' liability law; but ultimately a more far-reaching and thoroughgoing law must be passed. It is monstrous that a man or woman who is crippled in an industry, even as the result of taking what are the necessary risks of the occupation, should be required to bear the whole burden of the loss. That burden should be distributed and not placed solely upon the weakest individual, the one least able to carry it. By making the employer liable the loss will ultimately be distributed among all the beneficiaries of the business.

I also hope that there will be legislation increasing the power of the National Government to deal with certain matters concerning the health of our people everywhere; the Federal authorities, for instance, should join with all the State authorities in warring against the dreadful scourge of tuberculosis. Your own State government, here in Massachusetts, deserves high praise for the action it has taken in these public health matters during the last few years; and in this, as in some other matters, I

hope to see the National Government stand abreast of the foremost State governments.

I have spoken of but one or two laws which, in my judgment, it is advisable to enact as part of the general scheme for making the interference of the National Government more effective in securing justice and fair dealing as between man and man here in the United States. Let me add, however, that while it is necessary to have legislation when conditions arise where we can only cope with evils through the joint action of all of us, yet that we can never afford to forget that in the last analysis the all-important factor for each of us must be his own individual character. It is a necessary thing to have good laws, good institutions; but the most necessary of all things is to have a high quality of individual citizenship. This does not mean that we can afford to neglect legislation. It will be highly disastrous if we permit ourselves to be misled by the pleas of those who see in an unrestricted individualism the all-sufficient panacea for social evils; but it will be even more disastrous to adopt the opposite panacea of any Socialistic system which would destroy all individualism, which would root out the fibre of our whole citizenship. In any great movement, such as that in which we are engaged, nothing is more necessary than sanity, than the refusal to be led into extremes by the advocates of the ultra course on either side. Those professed friends of liberty who champion license are the worst foes of liberty and tend by the reaction their

violence causes to throw the Government back into the hands of the men who champion corruption and tyranny in the name of order. So it is with this movement for securing justice toward all men, and equality of opportunity so far as it can be secured by governmental action. The rich man who with hard arrogance declines to consider the rights and the needs of those who are less well off, and the poor man who excites or indulges in envy and hatred of those who are better off, are alike alien to the spirit of our national life. Each of them should learn to appreciate the baseness and degradation of his point of view, as evil in the one case as in the other. There exists no more sordid and unlovely type of social development than a plutocracy, for there is a peculiar unwholesomeness in a social and governmental ideal where wealth by and of itself is held up as the greatest good. The materialism of such a view, whether it finds its expression in the life of a man who accumulates a vast fortune in ways that are repugnant to every instinct of generosity and of fair dealing, or whether it finds its expression in the vapidly useless and self-indulgent life of the inheritor of that fortune, is contemptible in the eyes of all men capable of a thrill of lofty feeling. Where the power of the law can be wisely used to prevent or to minimize the acquisition or business employment of such wealth and to make it pay by income or inheritance tax its proper share of the burden of government, I would invoke that power without a moment's hesitation.

But while we can accomplish something by legislation, legislation can never be more than a part, and often no more than a small part, in the general scheme of moral progress; and crude or vindictive legislation may at any time bring such progress to a halt. Certain Socialistic leaders propose to redistribute the world's goods by refusing to thrift and energy and industry their proper superiority over folly and idleness and sullen envy. Such legislation would merely, in the words of the president of Columbia University, "wreck the world's efficiency for the purpose of redistributing the world's discontent." We should all of us work heart and soul for the real and permanent betterment which will lift our democratic civilization to a higher level of safety and usefulness. Such betterment can come only by the slow, steady growth of the spirit which metes a generous, but not a sentimental, justice to each man on his merits as a man, and which recognizes the fact that the highest and deepest happiness for the individual lies not in selfishness but in service.

AT CANTON, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 30, 1907

We have gathered together to-day to pay our meed of respect and affection to the memory of William McKinley, who as President won a place in the hearts of the American people such as but three or four of all the Presidents of this country have ever won. He was of singular uprightness and purity of character, alike in public and in pri-

vate life; a citizen who loved peace, he did his duty faithfully and well for four years of war when the honor of the Nation called him to arms. As Congressman, as Governor of his State, and finally as President, he rose to the foremost place among our statesmen, reaching a position which would satisfy the keenest ambition; but he never lost that simple and thoughtful kindness toward every human being, great or small, lofty or humble, with whom he was brought in contact, which so endeared him to our people. He had to grapple with more serious and complex problems than any President since Lincoln, and yet, while meeting every demand of statesmanship, he continued to live a beautiful and touching family life, a life very healthy for this Nation to see in its foremost citizen; and now the woman who walked in the shadow ever after his death, the wife to whom his loss was a calamity more crushing than it could be to any other human being, lies beside him here in the same sepulchre.

There is a singular appropriateness in the inscription on his monument. Mr. Cortelyou, whose relations with him were of such close intimacy, gives me the following information about it: On the President's trip to the Pacific Slope in the spring of 1901 President Wheeler, of the University of California, conferred the degree of LL.D. upon him in words so well chosen that they struck the fastidious taste of John Hay, then Secretary of State, who wrote and asked for a copy of them from President Wheeler. On the receipt of this

copy he sent the following letter to President McKinley, a letter which now seems filled with a strange and unconscious prescience:

"Dear Mr. President:

"President Wheeler sent me the enclosed at my request. You will have the words in more permanent shape. They seem to me remarkably well chosen, and stately and dignified enough to serve—long hence, please God—as your epitaph.

"Yours faithfully,

"John Hay."

"University of California, Office of the President.

"By authority vested in me by the regents of the University of California, I confer the degree of Doctor of Laws upon William McKinley, President of the United States, a statesman singularly gifted to unite the discordant forces of the Government and mould the diverse purpose of men toward progressive and salutary action, a magistrate whose poise of judgment has been tested and vindicated in a succession of national emergencies; good citizen, brave soldier, wise executive, helper and leader of men, exemplar to his people of the virtues that build and conserve the state, society, and the home.

"Berkeley, May 15, 1901."

It would be hard to imagine an epitaph which a good citizen would be more anxious to deserve or

one which would more happily describe the qualities of that great and good citizen whose life we here commemorate. He possessed to a very extraordinary degree the gift of uniting discordant forces and securing from them a harmonious action which told for good government. From purposes not merely diverse, but bitterly conflicting, he was able to secure healthful action for the good of the state. In both poise and judgment he rose level to the several emergencies he had to meet as leader of the Nation, and, like all men with the root of true greatness in them, he grew to steadily larger stature under the stress of heavy responsibilities. He was a good citizen and a brave soldier, a Chief Executive whose wisdom entitled him to the trust which he received throughout the Nation. He was not only a leader of men, but preeminently a helper of men; for one of his most marked traits was the intensely human quality of his wide and deep sympathy. Finally, he not merely preached, he was, that most valuable of all citizens in a democracy like ours, a man who in the highest place served as an unconscious example to his people of the virtues that build and conserve alike our public life, and the foundation of all public life, the intimate life of the home.

Many lessons are taught us by his career, but none more valuable than the lesson of broad human sympathy for and among all of our citizens of all classes and creeds. No other President has ever more deserved to have his life work characterized

in Lincoln's words as being carried on "with malice toward none, with charity toward all." As a boy he worked hard with his hands; he entered the Army as a private soldier; he knew poverty; he earned his own livelihood; and by his own exertions he finally rose to the position of a man of moderate means. Not merely was he in personal touch with farmer and town dweller, with capitalist and wage-worker, but he felt an intimate understanding of each, and therefore an intimate sympathy with each; and his consistent effort was to try to judge all by the same standard and to treat all with the same justice. Arrogance toward the weak, and envious hatred of those well off, were equally abhorrent to his just and gentle soul.

Surely this attitude of his should be the attitude of all our people to-day. It would be a cruel disaster to this country to permit ourselves to adopt an attitude of hatred and envy toward success worthily won, toward wealth honestly acquired. Let us in this respect profit by the example of the republics of this Western Hemisphere to the south of us. Some of these republics have prospered greatly; but there are certain ones that have lagged far behind, that still continue in a condition of material poverty, of social and political unrest and confusion. Without exception the republics of the former class are those in which honest industry has been assured of reward and protection; those where a cordial welcome has been extended to the kind of enterprise which benefits the whole country, while incidentally,

as is right and proper, giving substantial rewards to those who manifest it. On the other hand, the poor and backward republics, the republics in which the lot of the average citizen is least desirable, and the lot of the laboring man worst of all, are precisely those republics in which industry has been killed because wealth exposed its owner to spoliation. To these communities foreign capital now rarely comes, because it has been found that as soon as capital is employed so as to give substantial remuneration to those supplying it, it excites ignorant envy and hostility, which result in such oppressive action, within or without the law, as sooner or later to work a virtual confiscation. Every manifestation of feeling of this kind in our civilization should be crushed at the outset by the weight of a sensible public opinion.

From the standpoint of our material prosperity there is only one other thing as important as the discouragement of a spirit of envy and hostility toward honest business men, toward honest men of means; this is the discouragement of dishonest business men. [Great applause.]

Wait a moment; I don't want you to applaud this part unless you are willing to applaud also the part I read first, to which you listened in silence. [Laughter and applause.] I want you to understand that I will stand just as straight for the rights of the honest man who wins his fortune by honest methods as I will stand against the dishonest man who wins a fortune by dishonest methods. And

I challenge the right to your support in one attitude just as much as in the other. I am glad you applauded when you did, but I want you to go back now and applaud the other statement. I will read a little of it over again. "Every manifestation of ignorant envy and hostility toward honest men who acquire wealth by honest means should be crushed at the outset by the weight of a sensible public opinion." [Tremendous applause.] Thank you. Now I'll go on.

From the standpoint of our material prosperity there is only one other thing as important as the discouragement of a spirit of envy and hostility toward honest business men, toward honest men of means, and that is the discouragement of dishonest business men, the war upon the chicanery and wrong-doing which are peculiarly repulsive, peculiarly noxious when exhibited by men who have no excuse of want, of poverty, of ignorance for their crimes. My friends, I will wage war against those dishonest men to the utmost extent of my ability, and I will stand no less stoutly in defence of honest men, rich or poor. Men of means and, above all, men of great wealth can exist in safety under the peaceful protection of the state only in orderly societies, where liberty manifests itself through and under the law. That is what you fought for, you veterans. You fought for the supremacy of the national law in every corner of this Republic. It is these men, the men of wealth, who more than any others should in the interest of the class to which

they belong, in the interest of their children and their children's children, seek in every way, but especially in the conduct of their lives, to insist upon and to build up respect for the law. It is an extraordinary thing, a very extraordinary thing, that it should be necessary for me to utter as simple a truth as that; yet it is necessary. It may not be true from the standpoint of some particular individual of this class of very wealthy men, but in the long run it is pre-eminently true from the standpoint of the class as a whole, no less than of the country as a whole, that it is a veritable calamity to achieve a temporary triumph by violation or evasion of the law, and we are the best friends of the man of property, we show ourselves the stanchest upholders of the rights of property when we set our faces like flint against those offenders who do wrong in order to acquire great wealth, or who use this wealth as a help to wrong-doing.

I sometimes feel that I have trenched a little on your province, Brother Bristol, and on that of your brethren, by preaching. But whenever I speak of the wrong-doing of a man of wealth or of a man of poverty, poor man or rich man, I always want to try to couple together the fact that wrong-doing is wrong just as much in one case as in the other, with the fact that right is just as much right in one case as in the other. I want the plain people of this country, I want all of us who do not have great wealth, to remember that in our own interest, and because it is right, we must be just as scrupulous

in doing justice to the man of great wealth as in exacting justice from him.

Wrong-doing is confined to no class. Good and evil are to be found among both rich and poor, and in drawing the line among our fellows we must draw it on conduct and not on worldly possessions. Woe to this country if we ever get to judging men by anything save their worth as men, without regard to their fortune in life. In other words, my plea is that you draw the line on conduct and not on worldly possessions. In the abstract most of us will admit this. It is a rather more difficult proposition in the concrete. We can act upon such doctrines only if we really have knowledge of, and sympathy with, one another. If both the wage-worker and the capitalist are able to enter each into the other's life, to meet him so as to get into genuine sympathy with him, most of the misunderstanding between them will disappear and its place will be taken by a judgment broader, juster, more kindly, and more generous; for each will find in the other the same essential human attributes that exist in himself. It was President McKinley's peculiar glory that in actual practice he realized this as it is given to but few men to realize it; that his broad and deep sympathies made him feel a genuine sense of oneness with all his fellow-Americans, whatever their station or work in life, so that to his soul they were all joined with him in a great brotherly democracy of the spirit. It is not given to many of us in our lives actually to realize this attitude to the

extent that he did; but we can at least have it before us as the goal of our endeavor, and by so doing we shall pay honor better than in any other way to the memory of the dead President whose services in life we this day commemorate.

AT KEOKUK, IOWA, OCTOBER 1, 1907

Men and Women of Iowa:

I am glad indeed to see you and to speak to you in this thriving city of your great and prosperous State. I believe with all my heart in the people of Iowa, for I think that you are good, typical Americans, and that among you there has been developed to a very high degree that body of characteristics which we like to regard as distinctively American.

During the last few years we of the United States have been forced to consider very seriously certain economic problems. We have made a beginning in the attempt to deal with the relations of the National Government—that is, with the relations of the people of the country—to the huge and wealthy corporations, controlled for the most part by a few very rich men, which are engaged in interstate business—especially the great railway corporations. You know my views on this matter. You know that I believe that the National Government, in the interests of the people, should assume much the same supervision and control over the management of the interstate common carriers that it now exercises over the national banks. You know furthermore that I believe that this supervision and control

should be exercised in a spirit of rigid fairness toward the corporations, exacting justice from them on behalf of the people, but giving them justice in return.

Recently I have been reading the work of the eminent Italian scholar Ferrero on the history of the Roman Republic, when the life of the Roman state had become that of a complex and luxurious industrial civilization. I am happy to say that the differences between that civilization and our own are more striking than the resemblances; and there is no warrant for our being drawn into any pessimistic comparison between the two civilizations. But there is every reason why we should study carefully the past in order to draw from it lessons for use in the present. One of the most striking features of the years which saw the downfall of the Roman Republic was the fact that the political life of Rome became split between two camps, one containing the rich who wished to exploit the poor, and the other the poor who wished to plunder the rich. Naturally, under such circumstances, the public man who was for the moment successful tended to be either a violent reactionary or a violent demagogue. Any such condition of political life is as hopelessly unhealthy now as it was then. I believe so implicitly in the future of our people, because I believe that the average American citizen will no more tolerate government by a mob than he will tolerate government by a plutocracy; that he desires to see justice done to and justice exacted from rich man

and poor man alike. We are not trying to favor any man at the expense of his fellows. We are trying to shape things so that as far as possible each man shall have a fair chance in life; so that he shall have, so far as by law this can be accomplished, the chance to show the stuff that there is in him. We have no intention of trying to work for the impossible and undesirable end of giving to the lazy, the thriftless, the weak, and the vicious, the reward that belongs to, and in the long run can only come to, the hard working, the thrifty, the resolute, and the honest. But we do wish to see that the necessary struggle in life shall be carried on under genuinely democratic conditions; that, so far as human action can safely provide it, there shall be an approximately fair start; that there shall be no oppression of the weak, and that no man shall be permitted to acquire or to use a vast fortune by methods or in ways that are tortuous and dishonest.

Therefore we need wise laws, and we need to have them resolutely administered. We can get such laws and such administration only if the people are alive to their interests. The other day I listened to an admirable sermon by Bishop Johnston of western Texas. His theme was that the vital element in judging any man should be his conduct, and neither his position nor his pretensions; and, furthermore, that freedom could only stay with a people which has the habit of self-mastery. As he said, the price of liberty is not only eternal vigilance, but eternal virtue; and I may add, eternal

common-sense. Each man here knows that he himself has been able to use his freedom to advantage only provided that he could master himself, that he could control his own passions and direct his own faculties. Each of you fathers and mothers here knows that if your sons are to do well in the world they must know how to master themselves. Every man must have a master; if he is not his own master, then somebody else will be. This is just as true of public life as of private life. If we can not master ourselves, control ourselves, then sooner or later we shall have to submit to outside control; for there must be control somewhere.

One way of exercising such control is through the laws of the land. Ours is a government of liberty, but it is a government of that orderly liberty which comes by and through the honest enforcement of and obedience to the law. At intervals during the last few months the appeal has been made to me not to enforce the law against certain wrong-doers of great wealth because to do so would interfere with the business prosperity of the country. Under the effects of that kind of fright which when sufficiently acute we call panic, this appeal has been made to me even by men who ordinarily behave as decent citizens. One newspaper which has itself strongly advanced this view gave prominence to the statement of a certain man of great wealth to the effect that the so-called financial weakness "was due entirely to the admitted intention of President Roosevelt to punish the large moneyed interests

which had transgressed the laws." I do not admit that this has been the main cause of any business troubles we have had; but it is possible that it has been a contributory cause. If so, friends, as far as I am concerned it must be accepted as a disagreeable but unavoidable feature in a course of policy which as long as I am President will not be changed. In any great movement for righteousness, where the forces of evil are strongly intrenched, it is unfortunately inevitable that some unoffending people should suffer in company with the real offenders. This is not our fault. It is the fault of those to whose deceptive action these innocent people owe their false position. A year or two ago certain representatives of labor called upon me and in the course of a very pleasant conversation told me that they regarded me as "the friend of labor." I answered that I certainly was, and that I would do everything in my power for the laboring man *except anything that was wrong*. I have the same answer to make to the business man. I will do everything I can do to help business conditions, except anything that is wrong. And it would be not merely wrong but infamous to fail to do all that can be done to secure the punishment of those wrong-doers whose deeds are peculiarly reprehensible because they are not committed under the stress of want. Whenever a serious effort is made to cut out what is evil in our political life, whether the effort takes the shape of warring against the gross and sordid forms of evil in some municipality, or whether it

takes the shape of trying to secure the honest enforcement of the law as against very powerful and wealthy people, there are sure to be certain individuals who demand that the movement stop because it may hurt business. In each case the answer must be that we earnestly hope and believe that there will be no permanent damage to business from the movement, but that if righteousness conflicts with the fancied needs of business, then the latter must go to the wall. We can not afford to substitute any other test for that of guilt or innocence, of wrongdoing or well-doing, in judging any man. If a man does well, if he acts honestly, he has nothing to fear from this Administration. But so far as in me lies the corrupt politician, great or small, the private citizen who transgresses the law—be he rich or poor—shall be brought before the impartial justice of a court. Perhaps I am most anxious to get at the politician who is corrupt, because he betrays a great trust; but assuredly I shall not spare his brother corruptionist who shows himself a swindler in business life; and, according to our power, crimes of fraud and cunning shall be prosecuted as relentlessly as crimes of brutality and physical violence.

We need good laws and we need above all things the hearty aid of good citizens in supporting and enforcing the laws. Nevertheless, men and women of this great State, men and women of the Middle West, never forget that law and the administration of law, important though they are, must always occupy a wholly secondary place as compared with

the character of the average citizen himself. On this trip I shall speak to audiences in each of which there will be many men who fought in the Civil War. You who wore the blue and your brothers of the South who wore the gray know that in war no general no matter how good, no organization no matter how perfect, can avail if the average man in the ranks has not got the fighting edge. We need the organization, the preparation; we need the good general; but we need most the fighting edge in the individual soldier. So it is in private life. We live in a rough, workaday world, and we are yet a long way from the millennium. We can not as a Nation and we can not as individuals afford to cultivate only the gentler, softer qualities. There must be gentleness and tenderness—the strongest men are gentle and tender—but there must also be courage and strength. I have a hearty sympathy with those who believe in doing all that can be done for peace; but I have no sympathy at all with those who believe that in the world as it now is we can afford to see the average American citizen lose the qualities that in their sum make up a good fighting man. You men must be workers who work with all your heart and strength and mind at your several tasks in life; and you must also be able to fight at need. You women have even higher and more difficult duties; for I honor no man, not even the soldier who fights for righteousness, quite as much as I honor the good woman who does her full duty as wife and mother. But if she shirks her duty as wife and

mother, then she stands on a par with the man who refuses to work for himself and his family, for those dependent upon him, and who in time of the Nation's need refuses to fight. The man or woman who shirks his or her duty occupies a contemptible position. You here are the sons and daughters of the pioneers. I preach to you no life of ease. I preach to you the life of effort, the life that finds its highest satisfaction in doing well some work that is well worth doing.

So much for what concerns every man and every woman in this country. Now, a word or two as to matters which are of peculiar interest to this region of our country.

Since I have been President I have traveled in every State of this Union, but my traveling has been almost entirely on railroads, save now and then by wagon or on horseback. Now I have the chance to try traveling by river; to go down the greatest of our rivers, the Father of Waters. A good many years ago when I lived in the Northwest I traveled occasionally on the Upper Missouri and its tributaries; but then we went in a flatboat and did our own rowing and paddling and poling. Now I am to try a steamboat. I am a great believer in our railway system; and the fact that I am very firm in my belief as to the necessity of the Government exercising a proper supervision and control over the railroads does not in the least interfere with the other fact that I greatly admire the large majority of the men in all positions, from the top

to the bottom, who build and run them. Yet, while of course I am anxious to see these men, and therefore the corporations they represent or serve, achieve the fullest measure of legitimate prosperity, nevertheless as this country grows I feel that we can not have too many highroads, and that in addition to the iron highroads of our railway system we should also utilize the great river highways which have been given us by nature. From a variety of causes these highways have in many parts of the country been almost abandoned. This is not healthy. Our people, and especially the representatives of the people in the National Congress, should give their most careful attention to this subject. We should be prepared to put the Nation collectively back of the movement to improve them for the Nation's use. Our knowledge at this time is not such as to permit me to go into details, or to say definitely just what the Nation should do; but most assuredly our great navigable rivers are national assets just as much as our great seacoast harbors. Exactly as it is for the interest of all the country that our great harbors should be fitted to receive in safety the largest vessels of the merchant fleets of the world, so by deepening and otherwise our rivers should be fitted to bear their part in the movement of our merchandise; and this is especially true of the Mississippi and its tributaries, which drain the immense and prosperous region which makes in very fact the heart of our Nation; the basin of the Great Lakes being already united with the basin of the Missis-

sippi, and both regions being identical in their products and interests. Waterways are peculiarly fitted for the transportation of the bulky commodities which come from the soil or under the soil; and no other part of our country is as fruitful as is this in such commodities.

You in Iowa have many manufacturing centres, but you remain, and I hope you will always remain, a great agricultural State. I hope that the means of transporting your commodities to market will be steadily improved; but this will be of no use unless you keep producing the commodities, and in the long run this will largely depend upon your being able to keep on the farm a high type of citizenship. The effort must be to make farm life not only remunerative but attractive, so that the best young men and girls will feel inclined to stay on the farm and not to go to the city. Nothing is more important to this country than the perpetuation of our system of medium-sized farms worked by their owners. We do not want to see our farmers sink to the condition of the peasants of the Old World, barely able to live on their small holdings, nor do we want to see their places taken by wealthy men owning enormous estates which they work purely by tenants and hired servants.

At present the ordinary farmer holds his own in the land as against any possible representative of the landlord class of farmer—that is, of the men who would own vast estates—because the ordinary farmer unites his capital, his labor, and his brains

with the making of a permanent family home, and thus can afford to hold his land at a value at which it can not be held by the capitalist, who would have to run it by leasing it or by cultivating it at arm's length with hired labor. In other words, the typical American farmer of to-day gets his remuneration in part in the shape of an independent home for his family, and this gives him an advantage over an absentee landlord. Now, from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole it is pre-eminently desirable to keep as one of our chief American types the farmer, the farm home-maker, of the medium-sized farm. This type of farm home is one of our strongest political and social bulwarks. Such a farm worked by the owner has proved by experience the best place in which to breed vigorous leaders alike for country and city. It is a matter of prime economic and civic importance to encourage this type of home-owning farmer.

Therefore, we should strive in every way to aid in the education of the farmer for the farm, and should shape our school system with this end in view; and so vitally important is this that, in my opinion, the Federal Government should cooperate with the State governments to secure the needed change and improvement in our schools. It is significant that both from Minnesota and Georgia there have come proposals in this direction in the appearance of bills introduced into the National Congress. The Congressional land grant act of 1852 accomplished much in establishing the agricultural col-

leges in the several States, and therefore in preparing to turn the system of educational training for the young into channels at once broader and more practicable—and what I am saying about agricultural training really applies to all industrial training. But the colleges can not reach the masses, and it is essential that the masses should be reached. Such agricultural high schools as those in Minnesota and Nebraska for farm boys and girls, such technical high schools as are to be found, for instance, in both St. Louis and Washington, have by their success shown that it is entirely feasible to carry in practical fashion the fundamentals of industrial training into the realms of our secondary schools. At present there is a gap between our primary schools in country and city and the industrial collegiate courses, which must be closed, and if necessary the Nation must help the State to close it. Too often our present schools tend to put altogether too great a premium upon mere literary education, and therefore to train away from the farm and the shop.

We should reverse this process. Specific training of a practical kind should be given to the boys and girls who when men and women are to make up the backbone of this Nation by working in agriculture, in the mechanical industries, in arts and trades; in short, who are to do the duty that should always come first with all of us, the duty of home-making and home-keeping. Too narrow a literary education is, for most men and women, not a real

education at all; for a real education should fit people primarily for the industrial and home-making employments in which they must employ the bulk of their activities. Our country offers unparalleled opportunities for domestic and social advancement, for social and economic leadership in the world. Our greatest national asset is to be found in the children. They need to be trained to high ideals of every-day living, and to high efficiency in their respective vocations; we can not afford to have them trained otherwise, and the Nation should help the States to achieve this end.

Now, men of Iowa, I want to say just a word on a matter that concerns not the States of the Mississippi Valley itself, but the States west of them, the States of the Great Plains and the Rocky Mountains. Unfortunately, I am not able on this present trip to visit those States, or I should speak to their own people on the point to which I now intend to allude; but after all anything that affects a considerable number of Americans who live under one set of conditions, must be of moment to all other Americans, for never forget, friends, that in the long run we shall all go up or go down together.

The States of the high plains and of the mountains have a peculiar claim upon me, because for a number of years I lived and worked in them, and I have that intimate knowledge of their people that comes under such conditions. In those States there is need of a modification of the land laws

that have worked so well in the well-watered fertile regions to the eastward, such as those in which you here dwell. The one object in all our land laws should always be to favor the actual settler, the actual home-maker, who comes to dwell on the land and there to bring up his children to inherit it after him. The Government should part with its title to the land only to the actual home-maker—not to the profit-maker, who does not care to make a home. The land should be sold outright only in quantities sufficient for decent homes—not in huge areas to be held for speculative purposes or used as ranches, where those who do the actual work are merely tenants or hired hands. No temporary prosperity of any class of men could in the slightest degree atone for failure on our part to shape the laws so that they may work for the permanent good of the home-maker. This is fundamental, gentlemen, and is simply carrying out the idea upon which I dwell in speaking to you of your own farms here in Iowa. Now in many States where the rainfall is light it is a simple absurdity to expect any man to live, still less to bring up a family, on one hundred and sixty acres. Where we are able to introduce irrigation, the homestead can be very much less in size—can, for instance, be forty acres; and there is nothing that Congress has done during the past six years more important than the enactment of the national irrigation law. But where irrigation is not applicable and the land can only be used for grazing, it may be that you can not run more than one

steer to ten acres, and it is not necessary to be much of a mathematician in order to see that where such is the case a homestead of one hundred and sixty acres will not go far toward the support of a family. In consequence of this fact, homesteaders do not take up the lands in the tracts in question. They are left open for anybody to graze upon that wishes to. The result is that men who use them moderately, and not with a view to exhausting their resources, are at the mercy of those who care nothing for the future and simply intend to skin the land in the present. For instance, the small sheep farmer who has a home and who wishes that home to pass on to his children improved in value will naturally run his flock so that the land will support it, not only to-day, but ten years hence; but a big absentee sheep owner, who has no home on the land at all, but simply owns huge migratory flocks of sheep, may well find it to his profit to drive them over the small sheep farmer's range and eat it all out. He can then drive his flocks on, whereas the small man can not. Of course, to permit such a state of things is not only evil for the small man, but is destructive of the best interests of the country. Substantially the same conditions obtain as regards cattle. The custom has therefore grown up of fencing great tracts of Government land without warrant of law. The men who fenced this land were sometimes rich men, who, by fencing it, kept out actual settlers and thereby worked evil to the country. But in many cases, whether they were

large men or small men, their object was not to keep out actual settlers, but to protect themselves and their own industry by preventing overgrazing of the range on the part of reckless stock owners who had no place in the permanent development of the country and who were indifferent to everything except the profits of the moment. To permit the continuance of this illegal fencing inevitably tended to very grave abuses, and the Government has therefore forced the fencers to take down their fences. In doing this we have not only obeyed and enforced the law, but we have corrected many flagrant abuses. Nevertheless, we have also caused hardship, which, though unavoidable, I was exceedingly unwilling to cause. In some way or other we must provide for the use of the public range under conditions which shall inure primarily to the benefit of the actual settlers on or near it, and which shall prevent its being wasted. This means that in some shape or way the fencing of pasture land must be permitted under restrictions which will safeguard the rights of the actual settlers. I desire to act as these actual settlers wish to have me in this matter. I wish to find out their needs and desires, and then to try to put them into effect. But they must take trouble, must look ahead to their own ultimate and real good, must insist upon being really represented by their public men, if we are to have a good result. A little while ago I received a very manly and sensible letter from one of the prominent members of the Laramie County (Wyo.) Cattle and Horse Grow-

ers' Association. My correspondent remarked incidentally in his letter, "I am a small ranchman, and have to plow and pitch hay myself," and then went on to say that the great majority of their people had complied with the governmental order, had removed their fences and sold their cattle, but that they must get some kind of a lease law which would permit them to graze their stock under proper conditions or else it would be ruinous to them to continue in the business. The think I have most at heart as regards this subject is to do whatever will be of permanent benefit to just exactly the people for whom this correspondent of mine spoke—the small ranchmen who have to plow and pitch hay themselves. All I want to do is to find out what will be to their real benefit, for that is certain to be to the benefit of the country as a whole. It may be that we can secure their interests best by permitting all homesteaders in the dry country to enclose, individually or a certain number of them together, big tracts of range for summer use, the tracts being proportioned to the number of neighboring homesteaders who wish to run their cattle upon it. It may be that parts of the range will only be valuable for companies that can lease it and put large herds on it; for the way properly to develop a region is to put it to those uses to which it is best adapted. The amount to be paid for the leasing privilege is to me a matter of comparative indifference. The Government does not wish to make money out of the range, but simply

to provide for the necessary supervision that will prevent its being eaten out or exhausted; that is, that will secure it undamaged as an asset for the next generation, for the children of the present home-makers. Of course we must also provide enough to pay the proper share of the county taxes. I am not wedded to any one plan, and I am willing to combine several plans if necessary. But the present system is wrong, and I hope to see, in all the States of the Great Plains and the Rockies, the men like my correspondent of the Laramie County Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, the small ranchmen "who plow and pitch hay themselves," seriously take up this matter and make their representatives in Congress understand that there must be some solution, and that this solution shall be one which will secure the greatest permanent well-being to the actual settlers, the actual home-makers. I promise with all the strength I have to co-operate toward this end.

AT ST. LOUIS, MO., OCTOBER 2, 1907

It is a very real pleasure to address this body of citizens of Missouri here in the great city of St. Louis. I have often visited St. Louis before, but always by rail. Now I am visiting it in the course of a trip by water, a trip on the great natural highway which runs past your very doors—a highway once so important, now almost abandoned, which I hope this Nation will see not only restored to all its former usefulness, but given a

far greater degree of usefulness to correspond with the extraordinary growth in wealth and population of the Mississippi Valley. We have lived in an era of phenomenal railroad building. As routes for merchandise, the iron highways have completely supplanted the old wagon roads, and under their competition the importance of the water highways has been much diminished. The growth of the railway system has been rapid all over the world, but nowhere so rapid as in the United States. Accompanying this there has grown in the United States a tendency toward the practically complete abandonment of the system of water transportation. Such a tendency is certainly not healthy, and I am convinced that it will not be permanent. There are many classes of commodities, especially those which are perishable in their nature and where the value is high relatively to the bulk, which will always be carried by rail. But bulky commodities which are not of a perishable nature will always be specially suited for the conditions of water transport. To illustrate the truth of this statement it would only be necessary to point to the use of the canal system in many countries of the Old World; but it can be illustrated even better by what has happened nearer home. The Great Lakes offer a prime example of the importance of a good water highway for mercantile traffic. As the line of traffic runs through lakes, the conditions are in some respects different from what must obtain on even the most important river. Nevertheless, it is well

to remember that a very large part of this traffic is conditioned upon an artificial waterway, a canal —the famous Soo. The commerce that passes through the Soo far surpasses in bulk and in value that of the Suez Canal.

From every standpoint it is desirable for the Nation to join in improving the greatest system of river highways within its borders, a system second only in importance to the highway afforded by the Great Lakes; the highways of the Mississippi and its great tributaries, such as the Missouri and Ohio. This river system traverses too many States to render it possible to leave merely to the States the task of fitting it for the greatest use of which it is capable. It is emphatically a national task, for this great river system is itself one of our chief national assets. Within the last few years there has been an awakening in this country to the need of both the conservation and the development of our national resources under the supervision of and by the aid of the Federal Government. This is especially true of all that concerns our running waters. On the mountains from which the springs start we are now endeavoring to preserve the forests which regulate the water supply and prevent too startling variations between droughts and freshets. Below the mountains, in the high dry regions of the western plains, we endeavor to secure the proper utilization of the waters for irrigation. This is at the sources of the streams. Farther down, where they become navigable, our aim must be to

try to develop a policy which shall secure the utmost advantage from the navigable waters. Finally, on the lower courses of the Mississippi, the Nation should do its full share in the work of levee building; and, incidentally to its purpose of serving navigation, this will also prevent the ruin of alluvial bottoms by floods. Our knowledge is not sufficiently far advanced to enable me to speak definitely as to the plans which should be adopted; but let me say one word of warning: The danger of entering on any such scheme lies in the adoption of impossible and undesirable plans, plans the adoption of which means an outlay of money extravagant beyond all proportion to the return, or which, though feasible, are not, relatively to other plans, of an importance which warrants their adoption. It will not be easy to secure the assent of a fundamentally cautious people like our own to the adoption of such a policy as that I hope to see adopted; and even if we begin to follow out such a policy it certainly will not be persevered in if it is found to entail reckless extravagance or to be tainted with jobbery. The interests of the Nation as a whole must be always the first consideration.

This is properly a national movement, because all interstate and foreign commerce, and the improvements and methods of carrying it on, are subjects for national action. Moreover, while of course the matter of the improvement of the Mississippi River and its tributaries is one which especially concerns the great middle portion of our country, the

region between the Alleghenies and the Rockies, yet it is of concern to the rest of the country also, for it can not too often be said that whatever is really beneficial to one part of our country is ultimately of benefit to the whole. Exactly as it is a good thing for the interior of our country that the seaports on the Atlantic and the Pacific and the Gulf should be safe and commodious, so it is to the interest of the dwellers on the coast that the interior should possess ample facilities for the transportation of its products. Our interests are all closely interwoven, and in the long run it will be found that we go up or go down together.

Take, for instance, the Panama Canal. If the Mississippi is restored to its former place of importance as a highway of commerce, then the building of the Panama Canal will be felt as an immediate advantage to the business of every city and country district in the Mississippi Valley. I think that the building of that canal will be of especial advantage to the States that lie along the Pacific and the States that lie along the Gulf; and yet, after all, I feel that the advantage will be shared in an only less degree by the States of the interior and of the Atlantic Coast. In other words, it is a thoroughly national work, undertaken for and redounding to the advantage of all of us—to the advantage of the Nation as a whole. Therefore I am glad to be able to report to you how well we are doing with the canal. There is bound to be a certain amount of experiment, a certain

amount of feeling our way, in a task so gigantic—a task greater than any of its kind that has ever hitherto been undertaken in the whole history of mankind; but the success so far has been astonishing, and we have not met with a single one of the accidents or drawbacks which I freely confess I expected we should from time to time encounter. We, in the first place, laid the foundation for the work by securing the most favorable possible conditions as regards the health, comfort, and safety of the men who were to do it; and now the Canal Zone is in point of health better off than the average district of the same size at home. Then we went at the problem of the actual digging and dam building. For over a year past we have been engaged in making the dirt fly in good earnest, and the output of the giant steam shovels has steadily increased. It is now the rainy season, when work is most difficult on the Isthmus, yet in the month of August last we excavated over a million and two hundred thousand cubic yards of earth and rock, a greater amount than in any previous month. If we are able to keep up substantially the rate of progress that now obtains we shall finish the actual digging within five or six years; though when we come to the great Gatun dam and locks, while there is no question as to the work being feasible, there are several elements entering into the time problem which make it unwise at present to hazard a prophecy in reference thereto.

Now, gentlemen, this leads me up to another

matter for national consideration, and that is our Navy. The Navy is not primarily of importance only to the coast regions. It is every bit as much the concern of the farmer who dwells a thousand miles from sea water as of the fisherman who makes his living on the ocean, for it is the concern of every good American who knows what the meaning of the word patriotism is. This country is definitely committed to certain fundamental policies —to the Monroe Doctrine, for instance, and to the duty not only of building, but, when it is built, of policing and defending the Panama Canal. We have definitely taken our place among the great world powers, and it would be a sign of ignoble weakness, having taken such a place, to shirk its responsibilities. Therefore, unless we are willing to abandon this place, to abandon our insistence upon the Monroe Doctrine, to give up the Panama Canal, and to be content to acknowledge ourselves a weak and timid nation, we must steadily build up and maintain a great fighting Navy. Our Navy is already so efficient as to be a matter of just pride to every American. So long as our Navy is no larger than at present, it must be considered as an elementary principle that the bulk of our battle fleet must always be kept together. When the Panama Canal is built it can be transferred without difficulty from one part of our coast to the other; but even before that canal is built it ought to be thus transferred to and fro from time to time. In a couple of months our fleet of great armored ships starts for the Pacific.

California, Oregon, and Washington have a coast line which is our coast line just as emphatically as the coast line of New York and Maine, of Louisiana and Texas. Our fleet is going to its own home waters in the Pacific, and after a stay there it will return to its own home waters in the Atlantic. The best place for a naval officer to learn his duties is at sea, by performing them, and only by actually putting through a voyage of this nature, a voyage longer than any ever before undertaken by as large a fleet of any nation, can we find out just exactly what is necessary for us to know as to our naval needs, and practice our officers and enlisted men in the highest duties of their profession. Among all our citizens there is no body of equal size to whom we owe quite as much as to the officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy of the United States, and I bespeak from you the fullest and heartiest support, in the name of our Nation and of our flag, for the services to which these men belong.

In conclusion I wish to say a word to this body, containing as it does so many business men, upon what is pre-eminently a business proposition, and that is the proper national supervision and control of corporations. At the meeting of the American Bar Association in this last August, Judge Charles F. Amidon of North Dakota read a paper on the Nation and the Constitution so admirable that it is deserving of very wide study; for what he said was, as all studies of law in its highest form ought to

be, a contribution to constructive jurisprudence as it should be understood not only by judges but by legislators, not only by those who interpret and decide the law, but by those who make it and who administer or execute it. He quoted from the late Justice Miller of the Supreme Court to show that even in the interpretation of the Constitution by this, the highest authority of the land, the court's successive decisions must be tested by the way they work in actual application to the national life; the court adding to its thought and study the results of experience and observation until the true solution is evolved by a process both of inclusion and exclusion. Said Justice Miller: "The meaning of the Constitution is to be sought as much in the national life as in the dictionary;" for, as has been well said, government purely out of a law library can never be really good government.

Now that the questions of government are becoming so largely economic, the majority of our so-called constitutional cases really turn not upon the interpretation of the instrument itself, but upon the construction, the right apprehension of the living conditions to which it is to be applied. The Constitution is now and must remain what it always has been; but it can only be interpreted as the interests of the whole people demand, if interpreted as a living organism, designed to meet the conditions of life and not of death; in other words, if interpreted as Marshall interpreted it, as Wilson declared it should be interpreted. The Marshall

theory, the theory of life and not of death, allows to the Nation, that is to the people as a whole, when once it finds a subject within the national cognizance, the widest and freest choice of methods for national control, and sustains every exercise of national power which has any reasonable relation to national objects. The negation of this theory means, for instance, that the Nation—that we, the ninety millions of people of this country—will be left helpless to control the huge corporations which now domineer in our industrial life, and that they will have the authority of the courts to work their desires unchecked; and such a decision would in the end be as disastrous for them as for us. If the theory of the Marshall school prevails, then an immense field of national power, now unused, will be developed, which will be adequate for dealing with many, if not all, of the economic problems which vex us; and we shall be saved from the ominous threat of a constant oscillation between economic tyranny and economic chaos. Our industrial, and therefore our social, future as a Nation depends upon settling aright this urgent question.

The Constitution is unchanged and unchangeable save by amendment in due form. But the conditions to which it is to be applied have undergone a change which is almost a transformation, with the result that many subjects formerly under the control of the States have come under the control of the Nation. As one of the justices of the Supreme Court has recently said: "The growth of national

powers, under our Constitution, which marks merely the great outlines and designates only the great objects of national concern, is to be compared to the growth of a country not by the geographical enlargement of its boundaries, but by the increase of its population." A hundred years ago there was, except the commerce which crawled along our seacoast or up and down our interior waterways, practically no interstate commerce. Now, by the railroad, the mails, the telegraph, and the telephone an immense part of our commerce is interstate. By the transformation it has escaped from the power of the State and come under the power of the Nation. Therefore there has been a great practical change in the exercise of the national power, under the acts of Congress, over interstate commerce; while on the other hand there has been no noticeable change in the exercise of the national power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and with the Indian tribes." The change as regards interstate commerce has been, not in the Constitution, but in the business of the people to which it is to be applied. Our economic and social future depends in very large part upon how the interstate commerce power of the Nation is interpreted.

I believe that the Nation has the whole governmental power over interstate commerce and the widest discretion in dealing with that subject; of course under the express limits prescribed in the Constitution for the exercise of all powers, such, for instance, as the condition that "due process of law"

shall not be denied. The Nation has no direct power over purely intrastate commerce, even where it is conducted by the same agencies which conduct interstate commerce. The courts must determine what is National and what is State commerce. The same reasoning which sustained the power of Congress to incorporate the United States Bank tends to sustain the power to incorporate an interstate railroad, or any other corporation conducting an interstate business.

There are difficulties arising from our dual form of government. If they prove to be insuperable resort must be had to the power of amendment. Let us first try to meet them by an exercise of all the powers of the National Government which in the Marshall spirit of broad interpretation can be found in the Constitution as it is. They are of vast extent. The chief economic question of the day in this country is to provide a sovereign for the great corporations engaged in interstate business; that is, for the railroads and the interstate industrial corporations. At the moment our prime concern is with the railroads. When railroads were first built they were purely local in character. Their boundaries were not coextensive even with the boundaries of one State. They usually covered but two or three counties. All this has now changed. At present five great systems embody nearly four-fifths of the total mileage of the country. All the most important railroads are no longer State roads, but instruments of interstate commerce. Probably eighty-five

per cent of their business is interstate business. It is the Nation alone which can with wisdom, justice, and effectiveness exercise over these interstate railroads the thorough and complete supervision which should be exercised. One of the chief, and probably the chief, of the domestic causes for the adoption of the Constitution was the need to confer upon the Nation exclusive control over interstate commerce. But this grant of power is worthless unless it is held to confer thoroughgoing and complete control over practically the sole instrumentalities of interstate commerce—the interstate railroads. The railroads themselves have been exceedingly shortsighted in the rancorous bitterness which they have shown against the resumption by the Nation of this long-neglected power. Great capitalists, who pride themselves upon their extreme conservatism, often believe they are acting in the interests of property when following a course so shortsighted as to be really an assault upon property. They have shown extreme unwisdom in their violent opposition to the assumption of complete control over the railroads by the Federal Government. The American people will not tolerate the happy-go-lucky system of no control over the great interstate railroads, with the insolent and manifold abuses which have so generally accompanied it. The control must exist somewhere; and unless it is by thoroughgoing and radical law placed upon the statute books of the Nation, it will be exercised in ever-increasing measure by the several States. The same considerations which

made the founders of the Constitution deem it imperative that the Nation should have complete control of interstate commerce apply with peculiar force to the control of interstate railroads at the present day; and the arguments of Madison of Virginia, Pinckney of South Carolina, and Hamilton and Jay of New York, in their essence apply now as they applied one hundred and twenty years ago.

The national convention which framed the Constitution, and in which almost all the most eminent of the first generation of American statesmen sat, embodied the theory of the instrument in a resolution, to the effect that the National Government should have power in cases where the separate States were incompetent to act with full efficiency, and where the harmony of the United States would be interrupted by the exercise of such individual legislation. The interstate railroad situation is exactly a case in point. There will, of course, be local matters affecting railroads which can best be dealt with by local authority, but as national commercial agents the big interstate railroad ought to be completely subject to national authority. Only thus can we secure their complete subjection to, and control by, a single sovereign, representing the whole people, and capable both of protecting the public and of seeing that the railroads neither inflict nor endure injustice.

Personally I firmly believe that there should be national legislation to control all industrial corporations doing an interstate business, including the control of the output of their securities, but as to these

the necessity for Federal control is less urgent and immediate than is the case with the railroads. Many of the abuses connected with these corporations will probably tend to disappear now that the Government —the public—is gradually getting the upper hand as regards putting a stop to the rebates and special privileges which some of these corporations have enjoyed at the hands of the common carriers. But ultimately it will be found that the complete remedy for these abuses lies in direct and affirmative action by the National Government. That there is constitutional power for the national regulation of these corporations I have myself no question. Two or three generations ago there was just as much hostility to national control of banks as there is now to national control of railroads or of industrial corporations doing an interstate business. That hostility now seems to us ludicrous in its lack of warrant; in like manner, gentlemen, our descendants will regard with wonder the present opposition to giving the National Government adequate power to control those great corporations, which it alone can fully, and yet wisely, safely, and justly control. Remember also that to regulate the formation of these corporations offers one of the most direct and efficient methods of regulating their activities.

I am not pleading for an extension of constitutional power. I am pleading that constitutional power which already exists shall be applied to new conditions which did not exist when the Constitution went into being. I ask that the national powers

already conferred upon the National Government by the Constitution shall be so used as to bring national commerce and industry effectively under the authority of the Federal Government and thereby avert industrial chaos. My plea is not to bring about a condition of centralization. It is that the Government shall recognize a condition of centralization in a field where it already exists. When the national banking law was passed it represented in reality not centralization, but recognition of the fact that the country had so far advanced that the currency was already a matter of national concern and must be dealt with by the central authority at Washington. So it is with interstate industrialism and especially with the matter of interstate railroad operation today. Centralization has already taken place in the world of commerce and industry. All I ask is that the National Government look this fact in the face, accept it as a fact, and fit itself accordingly for a policy of supervision and control over this centralized commerce and industry.

AT CAIRO, ILL., OCTOBER 3, 1907

Men of Illinois, and you, Men of Kentucky and Missouri:

I am glad to have the chance to speak to you today. This is the heart of what may be called the Old West, which we now call the Middle West, using the term to denote that great group of rich and powerful States which literally forms the heart of the country. It is a region whose people are dis-

tinctively American in all their thoughts, in all their ways of looking at life; and in its past and its present alike it is typical of our country. The oldest men present can still remember the pioneer days, the days of the white-tilted ox wagon, of the emigrant, and of the log cabin in which that emigrant first lived when he settled to his task as a pioneer farmer. They were rough days, days of hard work, and the people who did that work seemed themselves uncouth and forbidding to visitors who could not look below the surface. It is curious and amusing to think that even as genuine a lover of his kind, a man normally so free from national prejudices as Charles Dickens, should have selected the region where we are now standing as the seat of his forlorn "Eden" in "Martin Chuzzlewit." The country he so bitterly assailed is now one of the most fertile and productive portions of one of the most fertile and productive agricultural territories in all the world, and the dwellers in this territory represent a higher average of comfort, intelligence, and sturdy capacity for self-government than the people in any tract of like extent in any other continent. The land teems with beauty and fertility, and but a score of years after Dickens wrote it was shown to be a nursery and breeding ground of heroes, of soldiers and statesmen of the highest rank, while the rugged worth of the rank and file of the citizenship rendered possible the deeds of the mighty men who led in council and in battle. This was the region that brought forth mighty Abraham Lincoln, the incar-

nation of all that is best in democratic life; and from the loins of the same people, living only a little farther south, sprang another of our greatest Presidents, Andrew Jackson—"Old Hickory"—a man who made mistakes, like most strong men, but a man of iron will and incorruptible integrity, fearless, upright, devoted to the welfare of his countrymen, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, a typical American if ever there was one.

I commend a careful reading of "Martin Chuzzlewit" to the pessimists of to-day, to the men who, instead of fighting hard to do away with abuses while at the same time losing no jot of their buoyant hopefulness for the country, insist that all our people, socially and industrially, in their private lives no less than as politicians, newspaper men, and business men, are at a lower ebb than ever before. If ever any one of you feels a little downcast over the peculiarly gloomy view of the present taken by some well-meaning pessimist of to-day, you will find it a real comfort to read "Martin Chuzzlewit," to see what a well-meaning pessimist of the past thought of our people sixty-five years ago; and then think of the extraordinary achievement, the extraordinary gain, morally no less than materially, of those sixty-five years. Dickens can be read by us now with profit; Elijah Pogram, Hannibal Chollop, Jefferson Brick, and Scadder have their representatives to-day, plenty of them; and the wise thing for us to do is to recognize that these are still types of evil in politics, journalism,

business, and private life, and to war against them with all our hearts. But it is rank folly to regard these as the only, or the chief, types in our national life. It was not of much consequence whether Dickens made such an error or not, but it would be of great consequence if we ourselves did; for a foolish pessimism is an even greater foe of healthy national growth than a foolish optimism. It was not that Dickens invented characters or scenes that had no basis in fact; on the contrary, what he said was true, as far as it went; the trouble was that out of many such half truths he made a picture which as a whole was absurd; for often a half truth is the most dangerous falsehood. It would be simply silly to be angry over "Martin Chuzzlewit"; on the contrary, read it, be amused by it, profit by it; and don't be misled by it. Keep a lively watch against the present-day Pograms and Bricks; but above all, distrust the man who would persuade you to feel downhearted about the country because of these same Pograms and Bricks, past or present. It would be foolish to ignore their existence, or the existence of anything else that is bad in our national life; but it would be even more foolish to ignore the vaster forces that tell for righteousness. Friends, there is every reason why we should fight whatever is evil in the present. But there is also every reason why we should feel a sturdy and confident hope for the future. There are many wrongs to right; there are many and powerful wrong-doers against whom to war; and it would be base to shrink

from the contest, or to fail to wage it with a high, a resolute will. But I am sure that we shall win in the contest, because I know that the heart of our people is sound. Our average men and women are good men and women—and this is true in all sections of our country and among all classes of our countrymen. There is no other nation on earth with such vast natural resources, or with such a high standard of living and of industrial efficiency among its workers. We have as a Nation an era of unexampled prosperity ahead of us; we shall enjoy it, and our children will enjoy it after us. The trend of well-being in this country is upward, not downward; and this is the trend in the things of the soul as well as in the things of the body.

Government in its application is often a complicated and delicate work, but the principles of government are, after all, fairly simple. In a broad general way we should apply in the affairs of the national administration, which deals with the interests of all our eighty-odd millions of people, just the same rules that are necessary in getting on with our neighbors in our several neighborhoods; and the Nation as a whole should show substantially the same qualities that we would expect an honorable man to show in dealing with his fellows. To illustrate this, consider for a moment two phases of governmental action.

First as to international affairs. Among your own neighbors, among your friends, what is the attitude you like to see a man take toward his fel-

lows, the attitude you wish each of your sons to take when he goes out into the world? Is it not a combination of readiness and ability to hold his own if any one tries to wrong him, while at the same time showing careful regard not only for the rights but for the feelings of others? Of course it is! Of course the type of man whom we respect, whom we are proud of if he is a kinsman, whom we are glad to have as a friend and neighbor, is the man who is no milksop, who is not afraid, who will not tolerate nor hesitate to resent insult or injury, but who himself never inflicts insult or injury, is kindly, good-natured, thoughtful of others' rights—in short, a good man to do business with or have live in the next house or have as a friend. On the other hand, the man who lacks any of those qualities is sure to be objectionable. If a man is afraid to hold his own, if he will submit tamely to wrong-doing, he is contemptible. If he is a bully, an oppressor, a man who wrongs or insults others, he is even worse and should be hunted out of the community. But, on the whole, the most contemptible position that can possibly be assumed by any man is that of blustering, of bragging, of insulting or wronging other people, while yet expecting to go through life unchallenged, and being always willing to back down and accept humiliation if readiness to make good is demanded.

Well, all this is just as true of a nation as of an individual, and in dealing with other nations we should act as we expect a man who is both game

and decent to act in private life. There are few things cheaper and more objectionable, whether on the part of the public man or of the private man, on the part of a writer or of a speaker, an individual or a group of individuals, than a course of conduct which is insulting or hurtful, whether in speech or act, to individuals of another nation or to the representatives of another nation or to another nation itself. But the policy becomes infamous from the standpoint of the interests of the United States when it is combined with the refusal to take those measures of preparation which can alone secure us from aggression on the part of others. The policy of "peace with insult" is the very worst policy upon which it is possible to embark, whether for a nation or an individual. To be rich, unarmed, and yet insolent and aggressive, is to court wellnigh certain disaster. The only safe and honorable rule of foreign policy for the United States is to show itself courteous toward other nations, scrupulous not to infringe upon their rights, and yet able and ready to defend its own. This Nation is now on terms of the most cordial good-will with all other nations. Let us make it a prime object of our policy to preserve these conditions. To do so it is necessary on the one hand to mete out a generous justice to all other peoples and show them courtesy and respect; and on the other hand, as we are yet a good way off from the millennium, to keep ourselves in such shape as to make it evident to all men that we desire peace

because we think it is just and right and not from motives of weakness or timidity. As for the first requisite, this means that not only the Government but the people as a whole shall act in the needed spirit; for otherwise the folly of a few individuals may work lasting discredit to the whole Nation. The second requisite is more easily secured—let us build up and maintain at the highest point of efficiency the United States Navy. In any great war on land we should have to rely in the future as we have relied in the past chiefly upon volunteer soldiers; and although it is indispensable that our little army, an army ludicrously small relatively to the wealth and population of this mighty Nation, should itself be trained to the highest point and should be valued and respected as is demanded by the worth of the officers and enlisted men, yet it is not necessary that this army should be large as compared to the armies of other great nations. But as regards the Navy, all this is different. We have an enormous coast line, and our coast line is on two great oceans. To repel hostile attacks the fortifications, and not the Navy, must be used; but the best way to parry is to hit—no fight can ever be won except by hitting—and we can only hit by means of the Navy. It is utterly impossible to improvise even a makeshift navy under the conditions of modern warfare. Since the days of Napoleon no war between two great powers has lasted as long as it would take to build a battleship, let alone a fleet of battleships; and it takes just as long to

train the crew of a battleship as it does to build it; and as regards the most important thing of all, the training of the officers, it takes much longer. The Navy must be built and all its training given in time of peace. When once war has broken out it is too late to do anything. We now have a good Navy, not yet large enough for our needs, but of excellent material. Where a navy is as small as ours, the cardinal rule must be that the battleships shall not be separated. This year I am happy to say that we shall begin a course which I hope will be steadily followed hereafter, that, namely, of keeping the battleship fleet alternately in the Pacific and in the Atlantic. Early in December the fleet will begin its voyage to the Pacific, and it will number, friends, among its formidable fighting craft three great battleships, named, respectively, the "Illinois," the "Missouri," and the "Kentucky." It is a national fleet in every sense of the term, and its welfare should be, and I firmly believe is, as much a matter of pride and concern for every man in the farthest interior of our country as for every man on the seacoast. A long ocean voyage is mighty good training; and not the least good it will do will be to show just the points where our naval program needs strengthening. Incidentally I think the voyage will have one good effect, for, to judge by their comments on the movement, some excellent people in my own section of the country need to be reminded that the Pacific Coast is exactly as much a part of this Nation as the Atlantic Coast.

So much for foreign affairs. Now for a matter of domestic policy. Here in this country we have founded a great Federal democratic republic. It is a government by and for the people, and therefore a genuine democracy; and the theory of our Constitution is that each neighborhood shall be left to deal with the things that concern only itself and which it can most readily deal with; so that town, county, city, and State have their respective spheres of duty, while the Nation deals with those matters which concern all of us, all of the people, no matter where we dwell. Our democracy is based upon the belief that each individual ought to have the largest measure of liberty compatible with securing the rights of other individuals, that the average citizen, the plain man whom we meet in daily life, is normally capable of taking care of his own affairs, and has no desire to wrong any one else; and yet that in the interest of all there shall be sufficient power lodged somewhere to prevent wicked people from trampling the weak under foot for their own gain. Our constant endeavor is to make a good working compromise whereby we shall secure the full benefit of individual initiative and responsibility, while at the same time recognizing that it is the function of a wise government under modern conditions not merely to protect life and property, but to foster the social development of the people so far as this may be done by maintaining and promoting justice, honesty, and equal rights. We believe in a real, not a sham, democracy. We believe

in democracy as regards political rights, as regards education, and, finally, as regards industrial conditions. By democracy we understand securing, as far as it is humanly possible to secure it, equality of opportunity, equality of the conditions under which each man is to show the stuff that is in him and to achieve the measure of success to which his own force of mind and character entitle him. Religiously this means that each man is to have the right, unhindered by the state, to worship his Creator as his conscience dictates, granting freely to others the same freedom which he asks for himself. Politically we can be said substantially to have worked out our democratic ideals, and the same is true, thanks to the common schools, in educational matters. But in industry there has not as yet been the governmental growth necessary in order to meet the tremendous changes brought about in industrial conditions by steam and electricity. It is not in accordance with our principles that literally despotic power should be put into the hands of a few men in the affairs of the industrial world. Our effort must be for a just and effective plan of action which, while scrupulously safeguarding the rights of the men of wealth, shall yet, so far as is humanly possible, secure under the law to all men equality of opportunity to make a living. It is to the interest of all of us that the man of exceptional business capacity should be amply rewarded; and there is nothing inconsistent with this in our insistence that he shall not be guilty of

bribery or extortion, and that the rights of the wage-worker and of the man of small means, who are themselves honest and hard working, shall be scrupulously safeguarded. The instruments for the exercise of modern industrial power are the great corporations which, though created by the individual States, have grown far beyond the control of those States and transact their business throughout large sections of the Union. These corporations, like the industrial conditions which have called them into being, did not exist when the Constitution was founded; but the wise forethought of the founders provided, under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, for the very emergency which has arisen, if only our people as a whole will realize what this emergency is; for if the people thoroughly realize it, their governmental representatives will soon realize it also. The National Government alone has sufficiently extensive power and jurisdiction to exercise adequate control over the great interstate corporations. While this thorough supervision and control by the National Government is desirable primarily in the interest of the people, it will also, I firmly believe, be to the benefit of those corporations themselves which desire to be honest and law-abiding. Only thus can we put over these corporations one competent and efficient sovereign—the Nation—able both to exact justice from them and to secure justice for them, so that they may not be alternately pampered and oppressed. The proposal need be dreaded only by

those corporations which do not wish to obey the law or to be controlled in just fashion, but prefer to take their chances under the present lack of all system and to court the chance of getting improper favors as offsetting the chance of being blackmailed —an attitude rendered familiar in the past by those corporations which had thriven under certain corrupt and lawless city governments.

The first need is to exercise this Federal control in thoroughgoing and efficient fashion over the railroads, which, because of their peculiar position, offer the most immediate and urgent problem. The American people abhor a vacuum, and are determined that this control shall be exercised somewhere; it is most unwise for the railroads not to recognize this and to submit to it as the first requisite of the situation. When this control is exercised in some such fashion as it is now exercised over the national banks, there will be no falling off in business prosperity. On the contrary, the chances for the average man to do better will be increased. Undoubtedly there will be much less opportunity than at present for a very few individuals not of the most scrupulous type to amass great fortunes by speculating in and manipulating securities which are issued without any kind of control or supervision. But there will be plenty of room left for ample legitimate reward for business genius, while the chance for the man who is not a business genius, but who is a good, thrifty, hard-working citizen, will be better. I do not be-

lieve that our efforts will have anything but a beneficial effect upon the permanent prosperity of the country; and, as a matter of fact, even as regards any temporary effect, I think that any trouble is due fundamentally not to the fact that the national authorities have discovered and corrected certain abuses, but to the fact that those abuses were there to be discovered. I think that the excellent people who have complained of our policy as hurting business have shown much the same spirit as the child who regards the dentist and not the ulcerated tooth as the real source of his woe. I am as certain as I can be of anything that the course we are pursuing will ultimately help business; for the corrupt man of business is as great a foe to this country as the corrupt politician. Both stand on the same evil eminence of infamy. Against both it is necessary to war; and if, unfortunately, in either type of warfare, a few innocent people are hurt, the responsibility lies not with us, but with those who have misled them to their hurt.

This is a rapidly growing nation, on a new continent, and in an era of new, complex, and ever-shifting conditions. Often it is necessary to devise new methods of meeting these new conditions. We must regard the past, but we must not regard only the past. We must also think of the future; and while we must learn by experience, we can not afford to pay heed merely to the teachings of experience. The great preacher Channing in his essay on "The Union" spoke with fine insight on this

very point. In commenting on the New England statesman Cabot, whom he greatly admired, he said that nevertheless "he had too much of the wisdom of experience; he wanted what may be called the wisdom of hope." He then continued in words which have a peculiar fitness for the conditions of to-day: "We apprehend that it is possible to make experience too much our guide. There are seasons in human affairs, of inward and outward revolution, when new depths seem to be broken up in the soul, when new wants are unfolded in multitudes, and a new and undefined good is thirsted for. These are periods when the principles of experience need to be modified, when hope and trust and instinct claim a share with prudence in the guidance of affairs, when in truth *to dare* is the highest wisdom."

These sentences should be carefully pondered by those men, often very good men, who forget that constructive change offers the best method of avoiding destructive change; that reform is the antidote to revolution; and that social reform is not the precursor but the preventive of Socialism.

TO THE DEEP WATERWAY CONVENTION AT MEMPHIS, TENN., OCTOBER 4, 1907

Under any circumstances I should welcome the chance of speaking at Memphis in the old historic State of Tennessee, rich in its glorious past and in the certainty of an even greater future; but I especially congratulate myself that I am able to

speak here on an occasion like this, when I meet not only the citizens of Tennessee, but many of the citizens of Mississippi and Arkansas and of other States as well; and when the chief executives of so many States are gathered to consider a subject of momentous interest to all. The Mississippi Valley is a magnificent empire in size and fertility. It is better adapted to the development of inland navigation than any other valley in either hemisphere; for there are 12,000 miles of waterway now more or less fully navigable, and the conditions are so favorable that it will be easy to increase the extent of navigable waterways to almost any required degree by canalization. Early in our industrial history this valley was the seat of the largest development of inland navigation in the United States, and perhaps you will pardon my mentioning that the first steamboat west of the Alleghenies was built by a Roosevelt, my great-grandfather's brother, in 1811, for the New Orleans trade, and in that year made the trip from Pittsburg to New Orleans. But from various causes river and canal transportation declined all over the United States as the railroad systems came to their full development. It is our business to see that the decline is not permanent; and it is of interest to remember that nearly a century ago President Madison advocated the canalization of the Mississippi.

In wealth of natural resources no kingdom of Europe can compare with the Mississippi Valley and the region around the Great Lakes, taken to-

gether, and in population this huge fertile plain already surpasses all save one or two of the largest European kingdoms. In this empire a peculiarly stalwart and masterful people finds itself in the surroundings best fitted for the full development of its powers and faculties. There has been a great growth in the valley of manufacturing centres; the movement is good if it does not go too far; but I most earnestly hope that this region as a whole will remain predominantly agricultural. The people who live in the country districts, and who till the small or medium-sized farms on which they live, make up what is on the whole the most valuable asset in our national life. There can be just as real progress and culture in the country as in the city; especially in these days of rural free delivery, trolleys, bicycles, telephones, good roads, and school improvements. The valley of the Mississippi is politically and commercially more important than any other valley on the face of the globe. Here more than anywhere else will be determined the future of the United States and indeed of the whole western world; and the type of civilization reached in this mighty valley, in this vast stretch of country lying between the Alleghenies and the Rockies, the Great Lakes and the Gulf, will largely fix the type of civilization for the whole Western Hemisphere. Already, as our history shows, the West has determined our national political development, and the fundamental principle of present American politics, political equality, was originally a Western idea.

The wonderful variety of resources in different portions of the valley makes the demand for transportation altogether exceptional. Coal, lumber, corn, wheat, cotton, cattle—on the surface of the soil and beneath the soil the riches are great. There are already evident strong tendencies to increase the carrying of freight from the northern part of the valley to the Gulf. Throughout the valley the land is so fertile as to make the field for the farmer peculiarly attractive; and where in the West the climate becomes drier we enter upon the ranching country; while in addition to the products of the soil there are also the manufactures supplied in innumerable manufacturing centres, great and small. Cities of astonishing growth are found everywhere from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, from the Alleghenies to the Rockies; most of them being situated on the great river which flows by your doors or upon some of its numerous navigable tributaries. New mineral fields are discovered every year; and the constantly increasing use of all the devices of intensive cultivation steadily adds to the productive power of the farms. Above all, the average man is honest, intelligent, self-reliant, and orderly, and therefore a good citizen; and farmer and wage-worker alike — in the last analysis the two most important men in the community—enjoy a standard of living, and have developed a standard of self-respecting, self-reliant manhood, which are of good augury for the future of the entire Republic. No man can foresee the limit of

the possibility of development in the Mississippi Valley.

Such being the case, and this valley being literally the heart of the United States, all that concerns its welfare must concern likewise the whole country. Therefore, the Mississippi River and its tributaries ought by all means to be utilized to their utmost possibility. Facility of cheap transportation is an essential in our modern civilization, and we can not afford any longer to neglect the great highways which nature has provided for us. These natural highways, the waterways, can never be monopolized by any corporation. They belong to all the people, and it is in the power of no one to take them away. Wherever a navigable river runs beside railroads the problem of regulating the rates on the railroads becomes far easier, because river regulation is rate regulation. When the water rate sinks, the land rate can not be kept at an excessive height. Therefore it is of national importance to develop these streams as highways to the fullest extent which is genuinely profitable. Year by year transportation problems become more acute, and the time has come when the rivers really fit to serve as arteries of trade should be provided with channels deep enough and wide enough to make the investment of the necessary money profitable to the public. The National Government should undertake this work. Where the immediately abutting land is markedly benefited, and this benefit can be definitely localized, I trust that there will be care-

ful investigation to see whether some way can be devised by which the immediate beneficiaries may pay a portion of the expenses—as is now the custom as regards certain classes of improvements in our municipalities; and measures should be taken to secure from the localities specially benefited proper terminal facilities. The expense to the Nation of entering upon such a scheme of river improvement as that which I believe it should undertake, will necessarily be great. Many cautious and conservative people will look askance upon the project, and from every standpoint it is necessary, if we wish to make it successful, that we should enter upon it only under conditions which will guarantee the Nation against waste of its money, and which will insure us against entering upon any project until after the most elaborate expert examination, and reliable calculation of the proportion between cost and benefit. In any project like this there should be a definite policy, and a resolute purpose to keep in mind that the only improvements made should be those really national in their character. We should act on the same principle in improving our rivers that we should follow in improving our harbors. The great harbors are of consequence not merely to the immediate localities, but to immense stretches of country; and the same is true of the great rivers. It is these great rivers and great harbors the improvement of which is of primary national interest. The main streams should be improved to the highest practical degree of efficiency before improvements are at-

tempted on the branches, and work should be undertaken only when completion is in sight within a reasonable time, so that assured results may be gained and the communities affected depend upon the improvements. Moreover, as an incident in caring for the river so that it may become an efficient channel of transportation, the United States Government should do its full part in levee building, which, in the lower reaches of the river, will not only give a channel for commerce, but will also give protection to the adjacent bottom lands.

Immense sums have already been spent upon the Mississippi by the States and the Nation, yet much of it remains practically unused for commerce. The reasons for this fact are many. One is that the work done by the National Government at least has not been based upon a definite and continuous plan. Appropriations by Congress, instead of assuring the steady progress and timely completion of each piece of work as it was undertaken, have been irregular and uncertain. As a direct consequence, far-reaching plans have been discouraged and continuity in execution has been made impossible. It is altogether unlikely that better results will be obtained so long as the method is followed of making partial appropriations at irregular intervals for works which should never be undertaken until it is certain that they can be carried to completion within a definite and reasonable time. Planned and orderly development is essential to the best use of every natural resource, and to none more than to the best use of

our inland waterways. In the case of the waterways it has been conspicuously absent. Because such foresight was lacking, the interests of our rivers have been in fact overlooked, in spite of the immense sums spent upon them. It is evident that their most urgent need is a farsighted and comprehensive plan, dealing not with navigation alone, nor with irrigation alone, but considering our inland waterways as a whole, and with reference to every use to which they can be put. The central motive of such a plan should be to get from the streams of the United States not only the fullest but also the most permanent service they are capable of rendering to the Nation as a whole.

The industries developed under the stimulus of the railroads are for the most part permanent industries, and therefore they form the basis for future development. But the railroads have shown that they alone can not meet the demands of the country for transportation, and where this is true the rivers should begin to supplement the railroads, to the benefit of both, by relieving them of certain of the less profitable classes of freight. The more farseeing railroad men, I am glad to tell you, realize this fact, and many of them have become earnest advocates of the improvement of the Mississippi, so that it may become a sort of inland seaboard, extending from the Gulf far into the interior, and I hope ultimately to the Great Lakes. An investigation of the proposed Lakes-to-the-Gulf deep waterway is now in progress under an appropriation of

the last Congress. We shall await its results with the keenest interest. The decision is obviously of capital importance to our internal development and scarcely less so in relation to external commerce.

This is but one of the many projects which it is time to consider, although a most important one. Plans for the improvement of our inland navigation may fairly begin with our greatest river and its chief tributaries, but they can not end there. The lands which the Columbia drains include a vast area of rich grain fields and fruit lands, much of which is not easily reached by railways. The removal of obstructions in the Columbia and its chief tributaries would open to navigation and inexpensive freight transportation fully two thousand miles of channel. The Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers with their tidal openings into San Francisco Bay are partly navigable now. Their navigation should be maintained and improved, so as to open the marvellously rich valley of California to inexpensive traffic, in order to facilitate both rate regulation and the control of the waters for other purposes. And many other rivers of the United States demand improvement, so as better to meet the requirements of increasing production from the soil, increasing manufacture, and a rapidly growing population.

While thus the improvement of inland navigation is a vital problem, there are other questions of no less consequence connected with our waterways. One of these relates to the purity of waters used

for the supply of towns and cities, to the prevention of pollution by manufacturing and other industries, and to the protection of drainage areas from soil wash through forest covering or judicious cultivation. With our constantly increasing population this question becomes more and more pressing, because the health and safety of great bodies of citizens are directly involved.

Another important group of questions concerns the irrigation of arid lands, the prevention of floods, and the reclamation of swamps. Already many thousands of homes have been established on the arid regions, and the population and wealth of seventeen States and Territories have been largely increased through irrigation. Yet this means of national development is still in its infancy, and it will doubtless long continue to multiply homes and increase the productiveness and power of the Nation. The reclamation of overflow lands and marshes, both in the interior and along the coasts, has already been carried on with admirable results, but in this field, too, scarcely more than a good beginning has yet been made. Still another fundamentally important question is that of water-power. Its significance in the future development of our whole country, and especially of the West, is but just beginning to be understood. The plan of the city of Los Angeles, for example, to bring water for its use a distance of nearly two hundred and fifty miles—perhaps the boldest project of the kind in modern times—promises not only

to achieve its purpose, but in addition to produce a water-power sufficiently valuable to pay large interest on the investment of over $23,000,000.

Hitherto such opportunities for using water to double purpose have not always been seized. Thus it has recently been shown that water enough is flowing unused over Government dams, built to improve navigation, to produce many hundreds of thousands of horse-power. It is computed that the annual value of the available but unused water-power in the United States exceeds the annual value of the products of all our mines. Furthermore, it is calculated that under judicious handling the power of our streams may be made to pay for all the works required for the complete development and control of our inland waterways.

Forests are the most effective preventers of floods, especially when they grow on the higher mountain slopes. The national forest policy, inaugurated primarily to avert or mitigate the timber famine which is now beginning to be felt, has been effective also in securing partial control of floods by retarding the run-off and checking the erosion of the higher slopes within the national forests. Still the loss from soil wash is enormous. It is computed that one-fifth of a cubic mile in volume, or one billion tons in weight of the richest soil matter of the United States, is annually gathered in storm rivulets, washed into the rivers, and borne into the sea. The loss to the farmer is in effect a tax greater than all other land taxes

combined, and one yielding absolutely no return. The Department of Agriculture is now devising and testing means to check this enormous waste, through improved methods of agriculture and forest management.

Citizens of all portions of the country are coming to realize that, however important the improvement of navigation may be, it is only one of many ends to be kept in view. The demand for navigation is hardly more pressing than the demands for reclaiming lands by irrigation in the arid regions and by drainage in the humid lowlands, or for utilizing the water-power now running to waste, or for purifying the waters so as to reduce or remove the tax of soil waste to promote manufactures and safeguard life. It is the part of wisdom to adopt not a jumble of unrelated plans, but a single comprehensive scheme for meeting all the demands so far as possible at the same time and by the same means. This is the reason why the Inland Waterways Commission was created in March last, largely in response to petitions from citizens of the interior, including many of the members of this Congress. Broad instructions were given to the Commission in accordance with this general policy that no plan should be prepared for the use of any stream for a single purpose without carefully considering, and so far as practicable actually providing for, the use of that stream for every other purpose. Plans for navigation and power should provide with special care for sites

and terminals not only for the immediate present but also for the future. It is because of my conviction in these matters that I am here. The Inland Waterways Commission has a task broader than the consideration of waterways alone. There is an intimate relation between our streams and the development and conservation of all the other great permanent sources of wealth. It is not possible rightly to consider the one without the other. No study of the problem of the waterways could hope to be successful which failed to consider also the remaining factors in the great problem of conserving all our resources. Accordingly, I have asked the Waterways Commission to take account of the orderly development and conservation, not alone of the waters, but also of the soil, the forests, the mines, and all the other natural resources of our country.

Many of these resources which we have been in the habit of calling inexhaustible are being rapidly exhausted, or in certain regions have actually disappeared. Coal mines, oil and gas fields, and iron mines in important numbers are already worked out. The coal and oil measures which remain are passing rapidly, or have actually passed, into the possession of great corporations, who acquire ominous power through an unchecked control of these prime necessities of modern life; a control without supervision of any kind. We are consuming our forests three times faster than they are being reproduced. Some of the richest timber lands of

this continent have already been destroyed, and not replaced, and other vast areas are on the verge of destruction. Yet forests, unlike mines, can be so handled as to yield the best results of use, without exhaustion, just like grain fields.

Our public lands, whose highest use is to supply homes for our people, have been and are still being taken in great quantities by large private owners, to whom home-making is at the very best but a secondary motive subordinate to the desire for profit. To allow the public lands to be worked by the tenants of rich men for the profit of the landlords, instead of by freeholders for the livelihood of their wives and children, is little less than a crime against our people and our institutions. The great central fact of the public land situation, as the Public Lands Commission well said, is that the amount of public land patented by the Government to individuals is increasing out of all proportion to the number of new homes. It is clear beyond peradventure that our natural resources have been and are still being abused, that continued abuse will destroy them, and that we have at last reached the forks of the road. We are face to face with the great fact that the whole future of the Nation is directly at stake in the momentous decision which is forced upon us. Shall we continue the waste and destruction of our natural resources, or shall we conserve them? There is no other question of equal gravity now before the Nation.

It is the plain duty of those of us who for the

moment are responsible to make inventory of the natural resources which have been handed down to us, to forecast as well as we may the needs of the future, and so to handle the great sources of our prosperity as not to destroy in advance all hope for the prosperity of our descendants.

As I have said elsewhere, the conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem it will avail us little to solve all others. To solve it, the whole Nation must undertake the task through their organizations and associations, through the men whom they have made specially responsible for the welfare of the several States, and finally through Congress and the Executive. As a preliminary step, the Inland Waterways Commission has asked me to call a conference on the conservation of natural resources, including, of course, the streams, to meet in Washington during the coming winter. I shall accordingly call such conference. It ought to be among the most important gatherings in our history, for none have had a more vital question to consider.

There is a great national project already under way which renders the improvement of the Mississippi River and its tributaries specially needful. I mean the Panama Canal. The digging of that canal will be of benefit to the whole country, but most of all to the States of the Pacific Slope and the Gulf; and if the Mississippi is properly improved, to the States through which it flows. The digging of the Panama Canal is the greatest engineering feat

which has yet been attempted on this globe. The work has been going on most successfully, and with fewer drawbacks and difficulties than I had dared hope. When under our treaty with Panama we took possession of the Canal Zone, I was confident that we should be able to build the canal, but I took it for granted that we should meet many unexpected difficulties, not only in the actual work, but through, and because of, the diseases which had made the Isthmus a byword of unhealthfulness. The work done in making the conditions on the Isthmus healthy, however, has been so successful that at present the death-rate among the thousands of Americans engaged in the canal work is lower than in most localities in the United States. The organization has been perfected, the machinery installed, and the actual work, of the dredges, the steam shovels, and the dirt trains, is going on with constantly increasing rapidity and effectiveness. In the month of September just closed over fourteen hundred thousand cubic yards of material were removed, chiefly from the Culebra cut—the record removal, two hundred thousand yards better than the August record, of which I spoke the day before yesterday—and if this rate can be kept up, as I believe it will be kept up, the work of digging will be through in half a dozen years. The finishing of the locks of the great dam may take a little longer; but it begins to look as though the work will be completed even sooner than we had estimated.

Remember, gentlemen, that any work like this

entails grave responsibilities. The one intolerable position for a self-respecting nation, as for a self-respecting man, is to bluff and then not be able to make good. We have accepted the Monroe Doctrine as a cardinal feature of our foreign policy. We have undertaken not only to build but to police and to guard the Panama Canal. This means, unless we are willing to accept the humiliation of being treated some time by some strong nation as a vain and weak braggart, that we must build and maintain our Navy at the highest point of efficiency. When the canal is finished our Navy can move from one ocean to the other at will; for, remember that our doors open on both oceans. Until then our battle fleet, which should always be kept and manœuvred as a unit, ought now to appear in our home waters in one ocean and now to appear in our home waters in the other. And, O my friends and fellow-Americans, I most earnestly hope all our people will remember that in the fundamental questions most deeply affecting the life of the Nation there can be no proper division on party lines. Matters of such grave moment should be dealt with along the lines of consistent and well thought-out policy, without regard to any change of administration or of party at Washington. Such questions as the upbuilding and maintenance of the United States Navy, the completion of the Panama Canal in accordance with the plans now being carried out, the conservation of our national resources, and the improvement of the Mississippi River, are not party

questions. I am striving to accomplish what I can in such matters as these because the welfare of the Nation imperiously demands the action that I am taking. It is action in the interest of all the people, and the need for it will be as great long after I have passed out of public life as it is now. On these great points that I have mentioned, as on others I could mention, from the standpoint of the Nation the policy is everything, while it is of little importance who carries it out so long as it actually is carried out. Therefore I hope you will see to it, according to your best endeavor, that the policy is accepted as permanent, as something to be persevered in because of the interest of the whole people, and without regard to any possible political changes.

It ought not to be necessary for me to repeat, but I shall repeat, that I shall enforce the law just as quickly against the poor man who goes wrong as against the rich man, but no quicker. Whenever I have the power, I will use every resource of this Nation to stamp out murderous and lawless violence of the kind that breeds the anarchy of which you, Governor Patterson, spoke. And I shall no more stay my hand if the wrong-doer masquerades as a labor leader than I shall stay my hand if he masquerades as a captain of industry. I have expressed myself once definitely on the subject of undesirable citizens, and I stand by what I said—alike when the undesirable citizen is a great capitalist who wins a fortune by chicanery and wrong-doing to the hurt of his fellows and the damage of

the public conscience, and when he is a man who, under the guise of standing for labor, preaches and encourages violence and murder. I think that my position has at least the merit of being easily understood.

Before closing let me say a word upon the subject of the regulation of the railways by Congress under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. In my judgment the old days of happy-go-lucky indifference on the part of the public to the conduct of the corporations have passed. The American people has made up its mind that the conditions of modern industrialism are such as imperatively to demand supervision in the interest of the people as a whole over these great corporations. Most emphatically we should do full justice to them; but in return we should exact justice from them to the public. Some of them have become so habituated to disregarding everything but their own wishes and interests that the effort to establish a proper supervision over them has aroused on their part a curiously unreasonable antagonism. Their spokesmen do not seem to be aware that in what we have been trying to do we have not been improperly radical; using the word in its right sense, we have been conservative. We have merely taken the first steps in a policy which must be permanent if our democratic institutions are to endure; while, as a matter of course, we must also keep ever in mind that it is exactly as injurious to true democracy to inflict, as tamely to suffer, wrong. We can no more tol-

erate injustice to the railroads than injustice by them; one course is as immoral and as fundamentally mischievous and injurious to the people as the other.

In the matter of supervision of the great railway corporations we are acting as all civilized governments have already acted or are on the point of acting. The unrestricted issue of railway securities without any supervision, and under circumstances which often result in the gravest scandal, should not be permitted, and only by governmental action can it be prevented. It is already thus prevented in England and Germany, for instance. In England the first Royal Commission of Railways, of which that great parliamentary and popular leader, William Ewart Gladstone, was chairman, set forth as fundamental the very principles which here have at last been enacted into law, or which, as I firmly believe, will speedily be enacted. Of course, in any movement like this in which we are now engaged, in any movement looking to the regulation of vast corporate wealth engaged in interstate business, and to the cutting out of all abuses connected therewith, there will at times be suffering in which, unfortunately, many innocent people will be involved. But such suffering of the innocent is unavoidable in every great movement of life. Able and unscrupulous men are sure to deceive certain innocent outsiders and persuade them to invest in ventures under conditions which render loss certain when the force of the law is asserted. I am exceedingly

sorry for these innocent people; but it is not possible, because of them, to refuse to proceed against the men who have victimized them. It is just such a case as would occur if an unscrupulous man with counterfeit money visited some remote village, spent his money, and then disappeared. The local innkeeper and livery-stable keeper, the shopkeeper and the neighboring farmer, would all have been victimized; they would have lodged and fed the man, have supplied him with goods from the store and the farm, have hired horses and wagons to him, and in return would find themselves loaded with counterfeit money. If, under such circumstances, the Government found out what had happened it would have no alternative save to stop the circulation of the counterfeit money, though those possessing it were innocent. It would, of course, try to secure the conviction of the thief, but if he had escaped the jurisdiction of the law, it would nevertheless be impossible to let his innocent victims continue to pass his by no means innocent counterfeit money. Well, just the same thing is true when it comes to enforcing the law against business men of great wealth who have violated it. People are always beseeching me not to enforce it against them, because innocent outsiders may be hurt, or, only to enforce it with a gentleness that would prevent anybody, good or bad, from being hurt. It is not possible to comply with such requests, even when they are made in good faith. This is a government of law, a law which applies

to great and small alike. I am sorry indeed when it happens that big men who do wrong have involved smaller men with no bad intentions to such an extent that they suffer when we force the undoing of the wrong. But we can not hold our hands for such a consideration. The responsibility for the suffering of those innocent outsiders lies, not with us who put a stop to the wrong and punish the wrong-doers, but with these wrong-doers who mislead their victims.

In conclusion, friends, let me impress upon you one thing. Good laws can do much good; indeed, they are often indispensable. There is urgent need that we should have honest and efficient legislation, and honest and efficient action by those whose province it is to put the legislation into effect. But there is infinitely more need of a high individual average of character. The only permanent way to help any man is to help him to help himself. To teach him permanently to depend on anything save his own powers is to do him harm and not good. Let no man persuade you that laws by themselves, no matter how necessary and beneficial, will make any community happy and prosperous, or be even the chief factors in securing such happiness and prosperity. In the last analysis the vital factor in each man's effort to achieve success in life must be his own character, his own courage and uprightness and intelligence. In this audience are many men who wore the gray in the great Civil War. In every audience I have spoken to on this trip there

have been men who fought in either the Union or Confederate Army, and often representatives from both armies. Now, you men know that while in time of war there is need of good generalship, need of good organization, yet the determining factor in the regiment, the brigade, the army, is, and must ever be, the individual character of the individual soldier; his prowess, his hardihood, his unyielding resolution, his stern fidelity to duty, his capacity to act on his own individual responsibility when necessary, and yet to serve over or under or with others in perfect harmony and obedience. It is the character of the man in the ranks which primarily determines the failure or success of battle and campaign. In the great Civil War our armies, Northern and Southern alike, won their high position for ever and all time in the undying regard and admiration of their fellow-citizens, because the average man in the ranks, the average man who carried sabre or rifle, had this high standard of personal quality. Just as it was in time of war, so it is now in time of peace. If a man has not got the right stuff in him then no law can possibly get it out of him, because it is not there to get out. All that the law can do is to punish evil, to encourage what is good, and to secure, so far as is possible, an equality of opportunity for all men to show their strength of body, mind, and soul in the hard struggle of life.

AT VICKSBURG, MISSISSIPPI, OCTOBER 21, 1907

Mr. Mayor; Mr. Williams; and you, my hosts, my fellow-Americans:

It is indeed an honor for me to be to-day the guest of Vicksburg and of Mississippi, and I was inexpressibly touched by the greeting over a great arch of cotton bales as I came up from the boat, which said that Mississippi greets *her* President. I should not be fit to be President at all if I did not with all my might and main, with all my heart and brain, seek to be in the fullest sense the President of Mississippi just as I am the President of every State in this Union. I am glad to be here in this historic city, this city forever memorable because of the heroic siege in which victor and vanquished alike showed such splendid courage, such splendid fealty to the light as it was given to each to see the light; and before the Civil War, Mississippi's sons had shown that they knew how to fight. It was from Vicksburg that a company went to that Mississippi regiment which won undying renown in the Mexican War under the gallant leadership of its colonel who afterward became the favorite son not only of Mississippi, but of all the South—Jefferson Davis. And, my fellow-countrymen, think how fortunate we are, think what good fortune is ours as a Nation, that it is possible for the President of the Union to come here to-day to be conducted through your National Park by the surviving lieutenant-general of the Confederate

Army, and to feel that every instance of heroism recorded by the monuments alike to the Union and to the Confederate dead on that battlefield is a subject for just pride to every citizen of this Union, no matter where he may dwell. General Lee read to me that noble inscription on the Pennsylvania monument, an inscription that should make the heart of every true American thrill as he reads it: "Here brothers fought for their principles, here heroes died for their country, and a united people will forever cherish the precious legacy of their noble manhood." What other war is there of which we can say what we can say of this war? Before the generation that fought it has died away, the whole country grows to feel the same stern pride in the deeds, alike of those who fought so valiantly for what they believed to be right, and triumphed, and of those who fought so valiantly for what they, with equal sincerity, believed to be right, and lost.

Mr. Mayor, it is a good thing for an American President to travel all over the country, not for what he can teach, but for what he can learn. I have twice been down here in this alluvial delta of the Mississippi, bear hunting. On each occasion I learned a lot that had nothing to do with bear hunting. It seems to me that no American President could spend his time better than by seeing for himself just what this rich and wonderful region of the Lower Mississippi Valley is, so that he might go back, as I shall go back, to Washington, with the set purpose to get the United States

Government to do its full share in making the Mississippi River practically a part of the seacoast, in making it a deep channel inlet of the sea from the Gulf to the Great Lakes. As an incident of building the levees for the lower part of that great river, I wish to see them so built as to remove absolutely and completely from the minds of all the dwellers in the lowlands of Mississippi, Louisiana, and the portions of Tennessee and Arkansas nearby, all apprehensions of a possible overflow.

Mr. Williams, it has been suggested to me that we need to construe the Constitution broadly to get power to do what I want. As I think I heard you mention, there are some points on which you are a good federalist. I hope this is one of them! I heard a man say once, a man whom I have never seen afraid of anything, that he was afraid of the Mississippi, that he should be afraid to dwell by it and feel that it might overwhelm the land on which he lived. I wish to see the Federal Government build a system of dikes, of levees, down the course of the Mississippi, which shall make the farm, the plantation, of the man who lives by the river as safe as if he had a farm by the Illinois or the Hudson or the Red River of the North. I advocate no impossible task, no very difficult task. The people of Holland, a little nation, took two-thirds of their country out from under the ocean, and they live behind the dikes now, and they have lived behind them for centuries, in safety. With a tenth of the effort we, an infinitely mightier nation,

can take these incomparably rich bottom lands of the lower Mississippi out from all fear of ever being flooded, of ever being overflowed by the Mississippi. While I do not like generally to say in advance what I intend to do, I shall break my rule in this case and say that in my next message to Congress I shall advocate as heartily as I know how that the Congress now elected shall take the first steps to bring about that deep channelway and the attendant high and broad levee system which will make of these alluvial bottoms the richest and most populous and most prosperous agricultural country not only in this Union but on the face of the globe. Any policy which tends to the uplifting of any portion of our people, in the end distributes its benefits over the whole people. But it is far easier, ordinarily, to put into effect a policy which shall at the moment, and directly, help the people concentrated in the centres of population and wealth than it is to put into effect a policy which will help the dwellers in the country, the tillers of the soil. Now here we have a policy whose first direct benefit will come to the man on the farm, the man on the plantation, the tiller of the soil, the man who makes his fortune out of what he grows on the soil.

We are now digging the Panama Canal, and it is being well dug, and one reason why the work is being so well handled is that we refused to go into it until after careful study, so that we should surely avoid false steps; in other words, that we acted on Davy Crockett's principle, "Be sure you are

right and then go ahead." When we start this great, I think I may justly say, epoch-making, work of the improvement of the Mississippi, I want to be sure that we start in on principles that will prevent waste, extravagance, misapplication of effort. Now I shall have no small difficulty, men and women of Mississippi, in persuading some other people, some people in my own locality, of the wisdom of a policy such as that I advocate, a policy that means the expenditure of an immense sum of money, a policy which must continue over a long course of years. If that policy is attended in any way by jobbery, or folly, it will make it immeasurably more difficult to carry it through, and what we shall have to look out for is the actions of the men, probably very well-meaning men, who, in their anxiety to serve some particular district, will try to divert what should be a national effort to deepen a great national highway into a succession of efforts spread out so thin as to make all ineffective—efforts to do a little bit for a river here and a little bit for a river there and a little bit for a harbor over yonder. Do the big job first. Ultimately, I believe that there can be an enormous spread of the activity of the National Government in the care of our waterways; ultimately, I believe that the National Government can, for instance, do an immense amount in irrigation through certain portions of the Southern States not affected by the project for deepening the Mississippi. I am confident that in many of the Southern States the loss

to the farmer by the washing away of the soil of his farm, by the fact that the streams are at one period destructive torrents and at another period dry, makes infinitely the heaviest tax the farmer has to pay; and I believe that through the co-operation of the National Government, much can be done in the way of irrigation in certain of the Southern States—as much as has been done already by irrigation in the Far West. I also believe that ultimately we shall be able to canalize, to deepen, a very large number of waterways in the Union. But take the big rivers first; take the Mississippi and its most prominent tributaries first.

Now, my friends, I have spoken to you so far only of things affecting our material well-being. They are of prime importance. It is as important for a nation that there shall be a foundation of material prosperity as it is important for an individual that there shall be such a foundation. I distrust the man in private life who is filled with enthusiasm to reform mankind, but who can not support his own wife and family. Let the man first pull his own weight; let him support himself and those dependent upon him; he will find it at times a good deal of a job. When he has done this, he has laid the foundation for making himself a useful citizen in broader aspects. Now with the nation it is the same thing; we must have a basis of material prosperity on which to build, but woe to the nation which never rears on that foundation the superstructure of a higher life. General

Lee, you, and those who fought beside you and those who fought against you, are enshrined imperishably in the hearts of the people of the entire Union because, when the time came which called for you to risk all that you had—property, life, and all—for fealty to your ideals, you gladly spurned every other consideration, treated all else as naught in the balance compared to the chance to show your manhood on the field of battle. We honor you, we honor those who fought under you and those who fought against you, because they had that fine capacity to ignore everything else, life included, when honor called. But we need to have that spirit shown in civic life just as much as in military life. If ever our people become so sordid as to feel that all that counts is moneyed prosperity, ignoble well-being, effortless ease and comfort, then this nation shall perish, as it will deserve to perish, from the earth. In time of war we need the courage and disinterestedness of the highest type of soldier; in the ordinary times there is need that there shall be displayed a courage almost as high and even more steadfast. I say even more steadfast because, after all, a man can often pull himself up to meet a single crisis, when he would find it mighty hard to live right along, day after day, year after year, doing well the plain, common every-day work of his life. But exactly as we need the courage of the soldier and the patriotism of the soldier, so we need a genuine, steadfast devotion to right in every man, not only in our public servants—as Mr. Wil-

liams said, the public servant is in the long run only what the Warwick behind him, the people, makes him—not only in our public servants, but in all of us, individually. We need to show the spirit which will neither tolerate nor yet inflict injustice; and, gentlemen, we need that spirit to manifest itself not merely in applauding noble sentiments uttered on the platform, but in living up to those sentiments when we get home. It does no good whatever to go to a public meeting and applaud utterances about civic righteousness and the high ideal, if the man applauding does not try measurably to realize them by his own efforts in his own life.

Mr. Williams has said that for a day we can sink all merely party differences. Since I have been President I have found that not merely for a day, but for most of the time I needed to sink them because the differences of party are of infinitesimal importance compared to the great fundamentals of good citizenship upon which all American citizens should be united. We can afford to differ on the first questions only so long as we remember that difference on those questions must never be allowed to obscure our identity of feeling on the other and infinitely greater questions. We, as a Nation, have great and terrible problems to confront us in the century that is now opening. I do not believe that there is any other nation with a future as great as ours; but I believe in that future primarily because I believe that the average Ameri-

can citizen will bring to the solution of the political problems which confront us, the three cardinal virtues of honesty, courage and common-sense; and we shall need all three. In our highly complex industrial civilization of to-day we are confronted by certain ominous tendencies which must be met and overcome, not by indifference, not by a foolish optimism—which is but one degree less foolish than a foolish pessimism—but by a resolute purpose to face the evil, to recognize it, and then to overcome it. It has been well said that in the long run the most uncomfortable truth is a safer companion than the most pleasant falsehood. We must not bind ourselves to those tendencies which tell for evil in our modern life. There are plenty of them. Recognize them, and overcome them by the banded effort of the men who believe in public and private decency.

First and foremost, in our internal affairs let us strive steadily to secure absolute justice as between man and man without regard to the man's position, social or otherwise. Let us remember that justice can never be justice unless it is equal. Do justice to the rich man and exact justice from him; do justice to the poor man and exact justice from him—justice to the capitalist and justice to the wage-worker. Give each man every chance you can as long as he acts honestly; and if he acts dishonestly, hold him to the sharpest account, before the courts if it is possible, at the bar of public opinion when the case is one which the courts can

not reach. It is not an easy matter to do such justice. All the republics of antiquity failed in the end, as the Italian republics of the Middle Ages failed, because sooner or later they divided into two camps, one camp containing the poor who wished to plunder the rich, and the other the rich who wished to exploit the poor. When that division had once been accomplished, the downfall of the republic was at hand. It made no difference whether it was the rich that triumphed, or the mob that triumphed; the end had come in either case. This Republic of ours will survive because our people will not tolerate its being turned into either a government of a plutocracy, or the government of a mob; because by law and by the administration of the law we will punish the man of vast wealth who uses his wealth or acquires it in a way hostile to the interests of the people as a whole, and because under and through the law we will permit no mob rule in this land. Not only must we do justice to each man, but we must not be frightened out of doing justice merely because it happens to be advocated by somebody whom we do not like. I have an equally hearty aversion for the reactionary and the demagogue; but I am not going to be driven out of fealty to my principles because certain of them are championed by the reactionary and certain others by the demagogue. The reactionary is always strongly for the rights of property; so am I, and even if I do not like him I will protect him to the extent of my power if any man tries to wrong

him, and I will not be driven away from championship of the rights of property upon which all our civilization rests because they happened also to be championed by people who champion furthermore the abuses of wealth. And incidentally, I will try to help that reactionary in spite of himself, by correcting the abuses of which he is guilty and punishing him when he commits them; thereby doing more to safeguard the real rights of property than can be done in any other way. So with the demagogues. Most demagogues advocate some excellent popular principles, and nothing can be more foolish than for decent men to permit themselves to be put into an attitude of ignorant and perverse opposition to all reforms demanded in the name of the people because it happens that some of them are demanded by demagogues. No one man, no hundred or thousand men, can accomplish the kind of reform that I wish to see accomplished in our public life. It has got to come through the action of many executive, legislative, and judicial officers, each working in his own sphere; and while I agree heartily that the Constitution of the United States represents a fixed series of principles, yet I hold that in the name, in the interest, of the people it must be interpreted not as a strait-jacket, not as laying the hand of death upon our development, but as an instrument designed for the life and healthy growth of the Nation. I want to see executive, legislator, judge, not only desire to do right, but able to do right. Sometimes executive and

legislative officers are under temptation to yield too much to an improper public clamor. The temptation to the judge—the long term appointive or elective judge—is often just the reverse. The judge naturally, after he is on the bench, sees only people representing one small section of society. I want to see on the bench judges who will know and feel for all of our people. If it is in New York I want to see the judge who knows and feels for the East Side as much as for Fifth Avenue. I take that instance merely because it is what I am acquainted with in my own home. It applies, with a change of name, everywhere through the country. Now I trust I need not say—but I will say—that I do not mean for one moment that the judge shall yield to the strongest kind of popular clamor if it conflicts with his own sense of right. If all the people demand that the judge do one thing and his conscience tells him that it is wrong, he is disloyal to the real interests of the people that demand that thing if he does it—and the same holds true of executive and legislator. I will uphold the judge's hands in every way, in dealing with mob violence, in conserving the rights of property, in disregarding popular clamor if popular clamor is wrong; but I want to see the judge a man knowing the needs of the people as a whole; sympathizing with the wage-worker because he knows what he needs, just as he sympathizes with the capitalist because he knows what he needs. I hope to see that stand-

ard obtain in the Federal and State courts alike. We can exist as a Nation only if we do justice in that way between ourselves.

And now one word as to foreign policy. We can do our duty in the world only if we bear ourselves toward other nations as we would like to see an honorable man in private life bear himself toward his neighbors. Each of you here must feel, if he is married, and has children, that he wishes his son not to be a brawler, not to be a quarrelsome man, least of all to be an oppressor, a bully, a tyrant; but at the same time to be able to hold his own, to refuse to inflict injustice on the weak and to refuse to endure injustice on the part of the strong. I want to see the United States ever take precisely that attitude in international affairs. I trust that this Nation will never deal unjustly with any other nation, but I hope that it will be in such shape that it can always rely on its own might to protect it from injustice in return. We are yet a long way from the millennium, and therefore there is need that we shall be able to rely not only upon the right but upon having the power to make our right good. Above all, gentlemen, I trust that this Nation will never put itself in the position of bluffing, and, if called, of being unable to make good. I hope that we will stand for certain great policies, that we will stand for the Monroe Doctrine, that we will police and protect the Panama Canal; but I would a great deal rather that we announce now that we abandon both purposes than that we should

announce that we intended to persevere in both, but declined to provide ourselves with the means of making our words good. Therefore, gentlemen, I want all of you as good citizens to see to it that the work of building up Uncle Sam's Navy goes on. I do not know that I can "take the battleship 'Mississippi' up to Natchez," as some of you request; I have to find out about the draught of the "Mississippi" first; but I want enough "Mississippis" to guarantee that we will have peace. Nobody will molest us as long as our Navy is big enough and as long as the men shoot straight enough; and I am happy to be able to tell you some news that I just received yesterday. The target practice of our fleet under actual service conditions within the last month has shown far and away the best and most effective marksmanship that we have ever yet shown in the Navy; a markmanship so effective that I think we can say conservatively that we have nothing to fear when compared by a similar test with any other nation. Now I ask that the legislative branch provide enough money to keep the Navy build up and to supply all the powder and coal necessary for the use of the Navy. Just at this moment the fleet is getting ready to go to the Pacific. Our home waters are in the Pacific just as much as in the Atlantic. Somebody objected the other day on the ground that I should have to exceed the appropriation for coal if I sent the fleet to the Pacific. That is an error. We have got enough coal to send it to the Pacific. If there

is any failure in the appropriation it can not come back to the Atlantic; that is all. I mentioned that fact the other day to a gentleman who was advancing the argument as a reason why the ships should not leave the Atlantic; I explained to him that it would not interfere with their leaving the Atlantic; the only difficulty would be about their return to it.

Gentlemen, our Nation has a wonderful future. We are seated upon a continent; we front two great oceans; we can realize our future only upon condition that we do what I know we will do—that we conduct our policy as among ourselves in accordance with the immutable laws of righteousness, trying to get for each man and to exact from each man, justice, no more and no less; giving to each individual the largest possible liberty of individual action that is consistent .with seeing that he does not wrong other individuals; and in external affairs if we proceed upon the principle of so bearing ourselves as to avoid all cause of quarrel with any other nation, and yet of so bearing ourselves that it shall be to the interest of all other nations to avoid forcing an unjust quarrel on us

AT THE HERMITAGE NEAR NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, OCTOBER, 22, 1907

Judge Allison; and you, my fellow-countrymen:

Twenty years ago when I began my study of Tennessee history one of the Gamaliels at whose feet I sat was the Chancellor. My acquaintance, and I trust I may say my friendship, with the Chancel-

lor began then, and it is a peculiar pleasure to be introduced by him to-day. I can not imagine any American President failing to visit the tomb of Andrew Jackson if the opportunity comes. I trust that I came here a good American citizen; I shall certainly leave a better American for having been in The Hermitage, for having been where Andrew Jackson lived and died. I thank all of you for coming. I know that the rest of you will not grudge my saying that I am most deeply touched by the guard of honor of Confederate veterans who escorted me out here. O my friends and fellow-Americans, O citizens of the Volunteer State, citizens of the American Republic, think what great good fortune is ours as a Nation that now, but little over forty years after the close of the Civil War, where brother fought brother each as conscience bade him, each doing his duty valiantly and each striving to live up to the light as it was given him to see the light—O how fortunate we are that now all the memories of all the valiant deeds done in that war alike by the men who wore the blue and by the men who wore the gray form a heritage of honor for all Americans in whatever portion of this Union they live! I want to say a special word of thanks, too, to the band from the Industrial School. I am mighty glad to see you and hear you; I congratulate you on the way you handle yourselves. I am pleased to know the admirable work that the school is doing, and I believe that it is going to turn out some

mighty good citizens, to whom I am speaking *in posse* at present.

The Hermitage is a place of national pilgrimage to all who wish to honor one of the great patriots of the Nation's past. On behalf of the Nation I wish to thank the Ladies' Association who have taken hold of this property and have preserved it; but I do not think it just or fair that the burden which should be supported by the Nation should be a drain upon private purses. It is greatly to your credit that you have done this work which the Nation ought to have done. But I shall do all that I can to see that the Nation relieves you, not of the management but of the expense of the management hereafter; and I shall count on the heartiest support of all the Senators and Congressmen from Tennessee and from every other State, for Andrew Jackson was a Tennessean; but Andrew Jackson was an American, and there is not a State in this Union that can not claim him, that has not a right to claim him as a National hero. Surely no use of public money can be better, can be wiser, than in keeping up as an inspiration for the future the homes of the great statesmen of the past. I know the objection will be made that if we begin to take care of this house we shall be expected to take care of the houses of all the Presidents; but I draw a sharp distinction between Old Hickory and a great many other Presidents. The Hermitage was the home of one of the three or four greatest Presidents this Union has ever had, of one of the greatest

public leaders that any nation has developed in the same length of time. Andrew Jackson was a mighty National figure. His career will stand ever more and more as a source of inspiration for boy and man in this Republic. A soldier, a statesman, a patriot devoted with a single mind to the welfare of his whole country—let his whole country make it their part, acting through the National Government, to see that hereafter there is no question of keeping up The Hermitage and all its surroundings.

My friends, I have but a moment here in which to greet you. I did not come here to teach, but to learn. I did not come here to speak, but to pay my respects at the home and tomb of Andrew Jackson. The public questions which from time to time one generation has to meet and solve form a given set of problems. The next generation has to meet and solve another set of problems; but the spirit in which these problems must be met if they are to be successfully solved can not be changed. The man who has the stuff in him to make a good citizen in one generation would be a good citizen in another generation. This is true of civic life exactly as it is true of military life. At New Orleans General Jackson's troops fought with the long heavy pea rifle, the old flintlock, the weapon that the first hunters carried when they came over the mountains into Tennessee and Kentucky. Weapons change, tactics change, but the spirit of the soldier who wins victories remains unchanged from generation to generation, and I believe that at need the American

people would do well now in war because I believe that we have among us enough men who would be borne up by the same spirit to which Andrew Jackson was able successfully to appeal on that misty January morning when the lifting fog showed the scarlet ranks of the gallant British regulars advancing to die in the assault on the breastworks at New Orleans. So it is true of you men of the great war. You fought with muzzle-loaders—some of them were flintlocks, I guess. Now we have the high-power, small calibre repeating rifle. Weapons that were new or unknown in your day are antiquated now; tactics change; khaki is worn now instead of blue or gray; but if ever a crisis comes our men can only win if they show that they have now the same spirit that sent on to battle the men in blue and the men in gray in the dark days from '61 to '65. The spirit does not change, and it is the spirit of the man that counts as the ultimate and decisive factor in battle. We need organization, we need generalship; but organization and generalship can not avail unless the private soldier in the ranks, unless the average man with the musket, has the right stuff in him; for if he has not the right stuff in him you can not get it out of him. Just as it is in time of war so it is in time of peace. Since Andrew Jackson's time, in the seventy years that have elapsed since he was President, the problems have changed; we have seen the growth of a great complex industrial civilization. We need new laws, and therefore changed methods of administering

the law; but we must administer the laws and enact them in the spirit of Andrew Jackson if our Government is to continue to be a success. I do not say that Old Hickory was faultless; I do not know very many strong men that have not some of the defects of their qualities; but Andrew Jackson was as upright a patriot, as honest a man, as fearless a gentleman, as ever any nation had in public or private life. His memory will remain forever a precious National heritage, and his public career should be studied and assimilated by every public man who desires to be in good faith a servant of the whole people of the United States.

AT NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, OCTOBER 22, 1907

Governor; Mr. Mayor; and you, my fellow-citizens, my fellow-countrymen, men and women of the great, historic Commonwealth of Tennessee:

It is indeed a pleasure to be here to-day in the capital of this great State to say a word of greeting to its citizens gathered together. Tennessee's history dates back to the formation of this as an independent Nation. The hardy backwoodsmen of the Piedmont counties of Virginia and the Carolinas had crossed the divide and settled on what were then known as the Western Waters before the first Continental Congress met. This city was founded in the very middle of the Revolutionary War; for while our people on the seaboard were winning independence, the people west of them had

begun the great historic task of the American Nation, the conquest of the continent. At a critical moment in the struggle for American independence, when all of the Southern States were under the heel of Cornwallis's army, word was brought to the British leaders that the backwater men had crossed the mountains, that the men of the Western Waters, the mounted riflemen of Tennessee and Western Virginia, had come across through the defiles of the high hills, had won the battle of King's Mountain, and had raised again the standard of American freedom. It was a great and noble birth, and the after life of the State has proved worthy of it. I recall no other city which has the tomb of one President within its precincts and that of another but a little way outside. Tennessee and the sons of Tennessee from the date when the State was born to the present time have borne their part well and bravely in the affairs of our Nation.

I have come down on this trip, friends, primarily in connection with the material development of this country. I wish to see the great main artery of the Mississippi, and its chief affluents, made navigable highways, open to all the people of the United States, as only waterways can be. I believe that that development will prove of immediate benefit to all the States along the Mississippi. I believe it will prove of ultimate benefit to all the States outside of the Mississippi Valley, because I am convinced that in the long run, disregarding minor exceptions due to excep-

tional circumstances, if benefit comes to any portion of the American Republic, the benefit in the end diffuses itself over the entire Republic. Ultimately as a Nation we shall all go up or go down together. That fact should be kept in mind, not only as we deal with the material interests that are so important, but as we deal with the great moral and spiritual interests which must lie back of material well-being or else material well-being can count for but little. I do not wish to be misunderstood; I wish always to insist to our people individually, to the Nation as a whole, that there must be a certain amount of material well-being as a foundation and the more well-being you can have the better the foundation. I would not pay heed only to the things of the spirit; I would pay heed to the things of the body too; but I would not pay heed to them alone. It is with a nation just as it is with a man. The man's first business is to earn enough to keep his wife and children, and I have scant patience with the man who is filled with lofty zeal for mankind at large but whose family is in want. Before such a man begins to reform mankind let him see that his wife and children are fairly well off. But he must not stop there. If he is content only to keep his own home well, and cares nothing for his neighbor, cares nothing for civic duty, then he represents an element which, if it prevails, means that this Nation goes down to destruction. In addition to each man caring for his own well-being and the well-being

of his family, he must have that spirit of civic duty, that sense of civic righteousness, which will make his country dear to him, which will make the welfare of his fellows of moment in his eyes. So with our Nation. As a foundation, we must have material well-being, and I congratulate this State, I congratulate the Southern States, I congratulate the entire Union, upon the extraordinary material prosperity which as a Nation we have achieved. We have our ups and downs; no law and the administration of no law, can save any body of people from their own folly. If a section of the business world goes a little crazy, it will have to pay for it; and, being excessively human, when it does pay for it, it will want to blame some one else instead of itself. If at any time a portion of the business world loses its head, it has lost what no outside aid can supply. If there is reckless overspeculation, or dishonest business management, just as sure as fate there will follow a partial collapse. There has been trouble in the stock market, in the high financial world, during the past few months. The statement has frequently been made that the policies for which I stand, legislative and executive, are responsible for that trouble. Now, gentlemen, those policies of mine can be summed up in one brief sentence. They represent the effort to punish successful dishonesty. I doubt if those policies have had any material effect in bringing about the present trouble, but if they have, it will not alter in the slightest degree my determination that for the remaining

sixteen months of my term those policies shall be persevered in unswervingly. I believe that in our business world, taken as a whole, the standard of honesty is high; but where dishonesty exists, I intend to cut it out, and if possible to punish the dishonest man. My aim is to make the average man, the average citizen, the planter, the farmer, the cattle breeder, the merchant, the professional man, the railroad man, the banker—every man who is really doing honest business in an honest way, big or little—to make that man feel that he must have a pride in his American citizenship, to make him realize what being an American should really amount to, to get into his soul the belief that he will not only receive justice, but that he will have a part in meting out justice. If to arouse that type of civic manhood in our Nation it were necessary to suffer any temporary commercial depression, I should consider the cost but small. But, more than that, I do not for a moment admit that putting these policies into effect has had any real consequence in bringing about such conditions as we have from time to time seen in the stock market. All we have done has been to unearth the wrongdoing. It was not the fact that it was unearthed that did the damage. It was the fact that it existed to be unearthed—that is what did the damage. All I did was to turn on the light. I am responsible for turning on the light, but I am not responsible for what the light showed. It is impossible to cut out a cancer without making the

patient feel for a few days rather sicker than he felt before; but if it were not cut out the patient would die. No material well-being can save this Nation if it loses the lift toward higher things. I am well aware that in any such movement as that in which we have been engaged there are sinister men who, taking advantage of the movement to do away with the abuses of wealth, seek to inflame the people against all men of wealth, honest or dishonest. These men are for the moment with us, but they are not of us. So in any movement to conserve property, we find ourselves shoulder to shoulder with some reactionaries whose desire to conserve property is accompanied by a purpose to prevent any correction of the abuses of property. But we can not afford to permit either the demagogue on one side or the reactionary on the other to drive us away from the course of policy which we regard as vital for the well-being of this Nation. The thing most important to remember is that that policy has two sides. It would indeed be an evil day for this Nation, it would indeed mean the beginning of the end of our National greatness, if we ever permitted in this Republic a spirit which would discriminate against the honest man who achieves business success. There is nothing baser and meaner than to hate the honest man who prospers, simply because he has prospered; and I challenge the support of every good American when I say that the honest railroad man, the honest banker, the honest business man, the man who makes a fortune because his ex-

ceptional business ability enables him to render exceptional service to the community—I challenge the support of every good American citizen when I say that such a man shall receive the amplest protection and be safeguarded against all injustice.

We are a representative government—executives, legislators, judges; all public servants are representatives of the people. We are bound to represent the will of the people, but we are bound still more to obey our own consciences; and if ever there is any gust of popular feeling that demands what is wrong, what is unrighteous, then the true servant of the people, the man who truly serves the interest of the people, is that man who disregards the wish of the people to do evil. Let the representative represent the people so long as he conscientiously can; when he can no longer do so, let him do what his conscience dictates, and cheerfully accept the penalty of retirement to private life. No man will stand more strongly than I will in the defence of property so long as it is honestly acquired and honestly used. I will stand against the poor man if he does wrong just as I will stand against the rich man if he does wrong. I will stand against crimes of brutal violence just as I stand against crimes of unscrupulous cunning. Crime is crime, and it makes no difference whether the wrong is perpetrated by a plutocracy or by a mob, by a capitalist or by a wage-worker. There are certain men who effect to misunderstand my position on that point, who assert that I have talked against men of wealth

as such, that I have incited attacks upon the class that owns great wealth. Those men are blind if they see the facts in such a light. I will protect in every way in my power honest property; I will protect the honest man of wealth to the extent of my ability; and in no way can I ultimately protect the honest man of wealth so effectively as by doing everything in my power to bring to justice his dishonest brother of wealth. It is a difficult matter to punish as they ought to be punished the crimes of unscrupulous cunning committed by men of great wealth. It is a difficult matter to punish as he should be punished the man who at the head of a great business or at the head of a great railroad does wrong to the whole body politic by his management of that property. It is difficult because as yet we hardly have the proper laws, and still more because the people themselves through their representatives and personally do not yet fully realize how serious the crimes are which are committed in this fashion. The man who builds a railroad where it is needed and runs it honestly is a benefactor who is entitled to an ample reward for what he has done. We should back him up, protect him against unjust attacks. But the man who manipulates the securities of that road so as to swindle the outside public, or the stockholders or investors of any kind, or the shippers, or to oppress the wage-workers, or to swindle the people at large—that man is doing all that he can to bring down in ruin the fabric of our institutions, and it is our business to set our faces

like flint against his wrong-doing, to endeavor to undo that wrong-doing in the interest of the people as a whole, and primarily in the interest of the honest man of means. Remember this, that atonement in this world is largely vicarious; if wrong-doing is allowed to prosper, much of the penalty is in the end paid by innocent men. If we sit supine and let men of great wealth set before the country as a whole the standard of successful dishonesty so that young men are taught to think of business trickery, of evasion and violation of the law, of stock gambling and swindling, as the chief roads to financial success, not only do we bring about a deterioration of the public conscience as a whole, but as sure as fate we ultimately invite an ignorant and violent reaction which in trampling out the wrongs will trample out much right at the same time, which in punishing the wealthy wrong-doer will inflict the punishment so brutally and so unskilfully as to confound in it many men who have done decently and well. We should stop the process of gaining wealth by successful dishonesty, before it goes so far as to invite the very reaction which I dread; and the men of property, the men of great means, will do well to turn about and in the heartiest way back up a rational movement for reform, a rational movement for such supervision and control over the accumulation and abuse of these great fortunes as will, if not eliminate, at least minimize the evils of which I complain. Such a movement as that in which we are now engaged is not undertaken with any vindic-

tive purpose; it is undertaken only to cure evils and to prevent their recurrence. If the beneficiaries of those evils succeeded in stopping the movement, it would merely mean that in a very few years it would break forth again, and then it would probably be in the control of men who would legislate with a vindictive purpose, who would legislate and act as executives with a desire to hurt and damage the men at whom the movement was aimed. There has been no movement that can be more properly described as conservative, using the word with its real significance, than the movement which we have seen develop during the last four or five years, the movement for proper supervision and control, in the interests of the general public, of those colossal fortunes which, singly or in combination, are of such tremendous importance in the modern industrial world; to so control and supervise them that in their accumulation and their business use, there shall be, as far as we can prevent it, no wrong done to the small man, whether that small man is a competitor, a wage-worker, or an investor. In other words, gentlemen, our whole movement is simply and solely to make the decalogue and the golden rule of some practical moment in both the business and the political life of the community.

A PROCLAMATION

The season is nigh when, according to the time-hallowed custom of our people, the President

appoints a day as the especial occasion for praise and thanksgiving to God.

This Thanksgiving finds the people still bowed with sorrow for the death of a great and good President. We mourn President McKinley because we so loved and honored him; and the manner of his death should awaken in the breasts of our people a keen anxiety for the country, and at the same time a resolute purpose not to be driven by any calamity from the path of strong, orderly, popular liberty which as a Nation we have thus far safely trod.

Yet in spite of this great disaster, it is nevertheless true that no people on earth have such abundant cause for thanksgiving as we have. The past year in particular has been one of peace and plenty. We have prospered in things material and have been able to work for our own uplifting in things intellectual and spiritual. Let us remember that, as much has been given us, much will be expected from us; and that true homage comes from the heart as well as from the lips and shows itself in deeds. We can best prove our thankfulness to the Almighty by the way in which on this earth and at this time each of us does his duty to his fellow-men.

Now, therefore, I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, do hereby designate as a day of general thanksgiving Thursday, the 28th of this present November, and do recommend that throughout the land the people cease from their wonted occupations, and at their several homes and

places of worship reverently thank the Giver of all good for the countless blessings of our national life.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this second day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and one and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-sixth.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

By the President:

JOHN HAY,

Secretary of State.

A PROCLAMATION

According to the yearly custom of our people, it falls upon the President at this season to appoint a day of festival and thanksgiving to God.

Over a century and a quarter has passed since this country took its place among the nations of the earth, and during that time we have had on the whole more to be thankful for than has fallen to the lot of any other people. Generation after generation has grown to manhood and passed away. Each has had to bear its peculiar burdens, each to face its special crises, and each has known years of grim trial, when the country was menaced by malice domestic or foreign levy, when the hand of the Lord was heavy upon it in drouth or flood or pestilence, when in bodily distress and anguish of soul it paid the penalty of folly and a froward heart. Nevertheless, decade by decade, we have struggled

onward and upward; we now abundantly enjoy material well-being, and under the favor of the Most High we are striving earnestly to achieve moral and spiritual uplifting. The year that has just closed has been one of peace and of overflowing plenty. Rarely has any people enjoyed greater prosperity than we are now enjoying. For this we render heartfelt and solemn thanks to the Giver of Good; and we seek to praise Him not by words only but by deeds, by the way in which we do our duty to ourselves and to our fellow-men.

Now, therefore, I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, do hereby designate as a day of general thanksgiving Thursday, the twenty-seventh of the coming November, and do recommend that throughout the land the people cease from their ordinary occupations, and in their several homes and places of worship render thanks unto Almighty God for the manifold blessings of the past year.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this twenty-ninth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and two and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-seventh.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

By the President:
JOHN HAY,
Secretary of State.

A PROCLAMATION

The season is at hand when, according to the custom of our people, it falls upon the President to appoint a day of praise and thanksgiving to God.

During the last year the Lord has dealt bountifully with us, giving us peace at home and abroad and the chance for our citizens to work for their welfare unhindered by war, famine, or plague. It behooves us not only to rejoice greatly because of what has been given us, but to accept it with a solemn sense of responsibility, realizing that under Heaven it rests with us ourselves to show that we are worthy to use aright what has thus been entrusted to our care. In no other place and at no other time has the experiment of government of the people, by the people, for the people, been tried on so vast a scale as here in our own country in the opening years of the twentieth century. Failure would not only be a dreadful thing for us, but a dreadful thing for all mankind, because it would mean loss of hope for all who believe in the power and the righteousness of liberty. Therefore, in thanking God for the mercies extended to us in the past, we beseech Him that He may not withhold them in the future, and that our hearts may be roused to war steadfastly for good and against all the forces of evil, public and private. We pray for strength, and light, so that in the coming years we may with cleanliness, fearlessness, and wisdom, do our allotted work on the earth in such manner as to

show that we are not altogether unworthy of the blessings we have received.

Now, therefore, I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, do hereby designate as a day of general thanksgiving Thursday, the twenty-sixth of the coming November, and do recommend that throughout the land the people cease from their wonted occupations, and in their several homes and places of worship render thanks unto Almighty God for His manifold mercies.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this thirty-first day of October in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and three and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-eighth.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

By the President:
JOHN HAY,
Secretary of State.

A PROCLAMATION

It has pleased Almighty God to bring the American people in safety and honor through another year, and, in accordance with the long unbroken custom handed down to us by our forefathers, the time has come when a special day shall be set apart in which to thank Him who holds all nations in the hollow of His hand for the mercies thus vouchsafed to us. During the century and a quarter of our

national life we as a people have been blessed beyond all others, and for this we owe humble and heartfelt thanks to the Author of all blessings. The year that has closed has been one of peace within our own borders as well as between us and all other nations. The harvests have been abundant, and those who work, whether with hand or brain, are prospering greatly. Reward has waited upon honest effort. We have been enabled to do our duty to ourselves and to others. Never has there been a time when religious and charitable effort has been more evident. Much has been given to us and much will be expected from us. We speak of what has been done by this Nation in no spirit of boastfulness or vainglory, but with full and reverent realization that our strength is as nothing unless we are helped from above. Hitherto we have been given the heart and the strength to do the tasks allotted to us as they severally arose. We are thankful for all that has been done for us in the past, and we pray that in the future we may be strengthened in the unending struggle to do our duty fearlessly and honestly, with charity and good-will, with respect for ourselves and with love toward our fellow-men. In this great Republic the effort to combine national strength with personal freedom is being tried on a scale more gigantic than ever before in the world's history. Our success will mean much not only for ourselves, but for the future of all mankind; and every man or woman in our land should feel the grave responsibility resting upon him or her, for in

the last analysis this success must depend upon the high average of our individual citizenship, upon the way in which each of us does his duty by himself and his neighbor.

Now, therefore, I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, do hereby appoint and set apart Thursday, the twenty-fourth of this November, to be observed as a day of festival and thanksgiving by all the people of the United States at home or abroad, and do recommend that on that day they cease from their ordinary occupations and gather in their several places of worship or in their homes, devoutly to give thanks unto Almighty God for the benefits He has conferred upon us as individuals and as a Nation and to beseech Him that in the future His divine favor may be continued to us.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this first day of November in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and four and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-ninth.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

By the President:

JOHN HAY,

Secretary of State.

A PROCLAMATION

When nearly three centuries ago the first settlers came to the country which has now become this great Republic, they fronted not only hardship and

privation, but terrible risk to their lives. In those grim years the custom grew of setting apart one day in each year for a special service of thanksgiving to the Almighty for preserving the people through the changing seasons. The custom has now become national and hallowed by immemorial usage. We live in easier and more plentiful times than our forefathers, the men who with rugged strength faced the rugged days; and yet the dangers to national life are quite as great now as at any previous time in our history. It is eminently fitting that once a year our people should set apart a day for praise and thanksgiving to the Giver of Good, and, at the same time that they express their thankfulness for the abundant mercies received, should manfully acknowledge their shortcomings and pledge themselves solemnly and in good faith to strive to overcome them. During the past year we have been blessed with bountiful crops. Our business prosperity has been great. No other people has ever stood on as high a level of material well-being as ours now stands. We are not threatened by foes from without. The foes from whom we should pray to be delivered are our own passions, appetites, and follies; and against these there is always need that we should war.

Therefore, I now set apart Thursday, the thirtieth day of this November, as a day of thanksgiving for the past and of prayer for the future, and on that day I ask that throughout the land the people gather in their homes and places of worship, and

in rendering thanks unto the Most High for the manifold blessings of the past year, consecrate themselves to a life of cleanliness, honor, and wisdom, so that this Nation may do its allotted work on the earth in a manner worthy of those who founded it and of those who preserved it.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this second day of November in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and five and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and thirtieth. THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

By the President: ELIHU ROOT, *Secretary of State.*

A PROCLAMATION

The time of year has come when, in accordance with the wise custom of our forefathers, it becomes my duty to set aside a special day of thanksgiving and praise to the Almighty because of the blessings we have received, and of prayer that these blessings may be continued. Yet another year of widespread well-being has passed. Never before in our history or in the history of any other nation has a people enjoyed more abounding material prosperity than is ours; a prosperity so great that it should arouse in us no spirit of reckless pride, and least of all a spirit of heedless disregard of our responsibilities; but rather a sober sense of our many blessings, and a

resolute purpose, under Providence, not to forfeit them by any action of our own.

Material well-being, indispensable though it is, can never be anything but the foundation of true national greatness and happiness. If we build nothing upon this foundation, then our national life will be as meaningless and empty as a house where only the foundation has been laid. Upon our material well-being must be built a superstructure of individual and national life lived in accordance with the laws of the highest morality, or else our prosperity itself will in the long run turn out a curse instead of a blessing. We should be both reverently thankful for what we have received, and earnestly bent upon turning it into a means of grace and not of destruction.

Accordingly I hereby set apart Thursday, the twenty-ninth day of November, next, as a day of thanksgiving and supplication, on which the people shall meet in their homes or their churches, devoutly acknowledge all that has been given them, and to pray that they may in addition receive the power to use these gifts aright.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this twenty-second day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and six and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-first. THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

By the President: ELIHU ROOT, *Secretary of State.*

A PROCLAMATION

Once again the season of the year has come when, in accordance with the custom of our forefathers for generations past, the President appoints a day as the especial occasion for all our people to give praise and thanksgiving to God.

During the past year we have been free from famine, from pestilence, from war. We are at peace with all the rest of mankind. Our natural resources are at least as great as those of any other nation. We believe that in ability to develop and take advantage of those resources the average man of this Nation stands at least as high as the average man of any other. Nowhere else in the world is there such an opportunity for a free people to develop to the fullest extent all its powers of body, of mind, and of that which stands above both body and mind, character. Much has been given us from on high and much will rightly be expected of us in return. Into our care the ten talents have been entrusted; and we are to be pardoned neither if we squander and waste them, nor yet if we hide them in a napkin; for they must be fruitful in our hands. Ever throughout the ages, at all times and among all peoples, prosperity has been fraught with danger, and it behooves us to beseech the Giver of All Things that we may not fall into love of ease and of luxury; that we may not lose our sense of moral responsibility; that we may not forget our duty to God and to our neighbor. A great democracy like ours, a democracy based upon the principles of orderly liberty, can be perpetuated only

if in the heart of the ordinary citizen there dwells a keen sense of righteousness and justice. We should earnestly pray that this spirit of righteousness and justice may grow ever greater in the hearts of all of us, and that our souls may be inclined ever more both toward the virtues that tell for gentleness and tenderness, for loving kindness and forbearance one with another, and toward those no less necessary virtues that make for manliness and rugged hardihood — for without these qualities neither nation nor individual can rise to the level of greatness. Now, therefore, I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, do set apart Thursday, the twenty-eighth day of November, as a day of general thanksgiving and prayer, and on that day I recommend that the people shall cease from their daily work, and, in their homes or in their churches, meet devoutly to thank the Almighty for the many and great blessings they have received in the past, and to pray that they may be given the strength so to order their lives as to deserve a continuation of these blessings in the future.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this twenty-fifth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seven and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-second. THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

By the President: ELIHU ROOT, *Secretary of State.*

NAZARETH COLLEGE OF ROCHESTER
3 2769 01 794 251